The future of the U.S.-Japanese security alliance

Umbach, Frank

The Future of the U.S.-Japanese Security Alliance[1]

Frank Umbach

1. Introduction: The Incident at *Ominato*

> "A few years back three American warships steamed into *Mutsu Bay*, an indentation carved out of the northern coast of *Honshu*, the main Japanese Island. The ships were making for the Japanese naval base of *Ominato*. Once at the base it was evident the officer in charge knew the commander of the American ships well. Over dinner the American mentioned that his ships were low on fuel. Could he refuel at *Ominato*? There was some urgency to the situation as a storm was brewing in the pacific. The American boats had only a short window of opportunity to beat the storm back to the Seventh Fleet Headquarter at *Yokohama*. The Japanese commander was perfectly amenable. To go by regulations he would just notify Tokyo first. It turned out to be far from easy, however. Eventually he got his answer, which was no. Under no circumstances was the Japanese commander to provide to provide fuel for the American warships. Faced with this refusal the American boats retreated across *Tsugaru Straits* separating the main island of *Honshu* from *Hokkaido* and managed to buy the needed fuel from a commercial vendor in the port of *Hakodate*. Too much time had been lost, however. The storm was threatening in the Pacific, and this forced the American boats to return to *Yokusuka* the long way, around the *Sea of Japan* side of *Honshu* and then up to *Yokusuka* from the south."[2]

The *Ominato* story comes not from the American, but from the Japanese side. It was only one of many accounts and interesting pieces of information I heard in 1995 and the spring of 1996 from Japanese government and public officials (including serving military officers), as well as foreign policy specialists during several extraordinary briefings for a security study group consisting of Japanese and American researchers and academics, including two European participants from NATO countries. These briefings had been organized by a "*U.S.-Japan Security Treaty Study Group*" (established in December 1995) at the *Japan Institute for International Affairs* (*JIIA*) - a think tank affiliated with the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo. During these seminars, all officials spoke off the record, i.e. on condition of being able to preserve their anonymity.

While this particular story indicated that behind the scenes military co-operation between the United States and Japan was much less than ideal, we also heard positive reports. But as

---

1 This chapter is a revised and an updated version of a paper originally presented at the conference 'Japanese and German Foreign Policies in Comparative Perspective', Tuebingen, 21-23 September 1998. The analysis is based on findings of my research project 'Perspectives of Regional Security Cooperation in Asia-Pacific', sponsored by the Volkswagen Foundation. I would also like to use this opportunity to thank the Volkswagen Foundation and my former colleagues of our study group at the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) in Tokyo in 1996.

2 The following story here is taken from an unpublished paper by Mosher (1997: 1).

U.S. Prof. *Michael A. Mosher* (another member of this security study group) later concluded, the dominant tone of (our) discussions and briefings was rather critical. To the *Ominato* incident, he noted in 1997:

> "What this story illustrates is not Tokyo's arbitrariness or vindictiveness towards an ally, but in some ways the more astonishing fact that on the most mundane issues there has never been any explicit agreement between the Japanese *Self Defense Forces* and the American military. Even more astonishingly, there was in many instances little room for informal cooperation between commanders."[3]

In the past, the bilateral U.S.-Japanese security alliance played a key role, not only for the economic prosperity and external stability of Japan, but it also greatly contributed to international peace and stability in the region and on a global level. However, the *raison d'etre* for the U.S.-Japan security alliance began to dissipate with the collapse of the former Soviet Union (FSU) and the rusting away of the once mighty Soviet Pacific Fleet. Notwithstanding security concerns about North Korea and others, Japanese scholars and some U.S. experts were beginning to doubt any need for a U.S. military presence in Japan and particularly in Okinawa. In the United States, the first *Clinton* administration appeared more interested in domestic problems and was looking for a reduction in its global military burden. Against this background, the forced withdrawal of the U.S. troops from the Philippine military bases in 1992 signaled for many East Asian states the beginning of a military-political disengagement and a progressive withdrawal of the United States from the region under pressure.

These developments also seemed to confirm arguments in the literature on alliance theory that, once a unifying threat withers, alliances logically disintegrate or lose their *raison d'etre*.[4] But as we see in the case of NATO, alliances might survive even when the former common danger has disappeared. We can also conclude that alliances functioning during a bi-polar era remain fundamentally different in both theory and practice from those evolving in a multi-polar world.[5] Given the complex strategic and military dimensions of the Asia-Pacific region and the changing web of relations, "*realist*" and "*neoliberal-institutionalist*" theories of international relations have all their strengths and limits in explaining state behavior and international relations. In this light, a combination of these theories, together with network-models and *constructivism* (including the use of "*strategic culture*"[6] as an analytical tool) provides the most suitable framework for organizing thoughts and arguments.[7]

In the regional security perception of ASEAN member states and other Asian powers, including Japan, the PRC's policy in the South China Sea[8] seemed increasingly willing to fill out the "*political vacuum*" the U.S. left through the withdrawal of its armed forces from the

---

3 Ibid.
4 See also Feske (1997), Walt (1987: 32). See also Walt (1989), Snyder (1990 and 1991).
5 See also Spero/Umbach (1994: 15ff.).
6 Ball (1993), Johnston (1995) and Katzenstein (1996).
7 Lebow/Risse-Kappen (1993), Rittberger (1993.), Wendt (1995).
8 To Beijing's South China Sea policy and the implications for ASEAN, the ARF and CSCAP dialogue processes see Umbach (1998a and 2000b).

Philippines in 1992. At the same time, and in the light of growing semi-isolationist tendencies in the U.S. policy, an increasing number of American politicians (especially in the *U.S. Congress*) tried to counterbalance these tendencies, but demanded that Japan share more of the security burden in the western Pacific - partly to keep the U.S. involved and partly to balance China. Furthermore, the bilateral trade disputes, too, complicated the need for a redefinition of the bilateral security alliance between the United States and Japan prior to 1995.

On the other hand, since the beginning of the 1990s, Japan's foreign, security and defense policies have already undergone significant changes - albeit rather gradually and incrementally.[9] In November 1995, the *National Defense Outline* was revised for the first time in 20 years to meet the demands of the post-Cold War era. In April 1996, the Japan-U.S. security pact was "*redefined*" and the two countries issued a joint declaration outlining a renewed security alliance for the 21st century. On September 1997, revised "*guidelines*" for the security treaty were published which envisage Japanese support for the U.S. in minesweeping, evacuating and rescue operations and, subject to UN approval, the inspection of shipping in situations that may have an important influence on Japan's peace and security.

These changes in Japanese security and defense policies were and remain a subject of continuing public discussion in Japan itself as well as in other Asian countries, in particular China. At the same time, however, Japan has become a strong supporter of the new multilateral security institutions of the *ASEAN Regional Forum* (*ARF*) and the *Council Security Cooperation in Asia-Pacific* (*CSCAP*).[10] Furthermore, Japan is a key member of the *Korean Energy Development Organization* (*KEDO*) which is presently facing its greatest crisis (given the unresolved financial questions) since its creation in 1994.[11] These new multilateral security institutions seem to follow European experiences based on co-operative security models and regional integration. In the long-term, they may offer better security perspectives to Japan and other East Asian countries and thus replace the bilateral security ties with the U.S., as their proponents presume.

Against this background, questions arise concerning the purpose and objectives of the new bilateral security treaty and particularly of the "*guidelines*" for the U.S.-Japanese defense co-operation, the perception of the alliance in neighboring countries (particularly in China, South- and North Korea, Taiwan and the ASEAN states) and the expectations linked with the redefined security alliance, especially in the U.S. and Japan. Moreover, not all problems have been solved and parts of the new security and defense co-operation are still heavily disputed in Japan. In this light, and given the current financial and economic crisis, as well as the lack of political leadership in Japan, some doubts still remain whether Japan is really able to adhere to the agreed defense co-operation particularly in crises and emergency situations. In this paper, I

9 To these changes in Japan's foreign and security policies see once again Umbach (2000b).
10 See also Kawasaki (1997).
11 See Umbach (1999a and 1999b).

will analyze the evolution of the redefinition of the bilateral U.S.-Japan security alliance and focus specifically on the remaining problems and disputes.

2. The U.S.-Japanese Security Alliance in the Cold War

The Japan-U.S. security relationship did not start with the end of World War II, but began with the arrival of the U.S. fleet commanded by *Matthew C. Perry*, which led to the signing of a peace and amity treaty between the two countries and to the *Meiji* Restoration (1868). But, from the very beginning, this bilateral relationship could be characterized by the grim fact that the two nations have never been friendly on equal terms. The unequal nature was particularly evident in the first period after World War II, which lasted until the beginnings of the 1970s. The U.S. occupation carried out fundamental democratic reforms in almost all aspects of Japanese society, but also compromised on many others. During this time, the most important was the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy in its *1947 Constitution* (*Article 9*). A second period of the U.S.-Japan security alliance began 1951 and lasted until 1960. In 1951 both sides signed the *San Francisco Peace Treaty* and the highly unequal *Mutual Security Treaty*. Although the *Peace Treaty* formally ended the occupation, Japan remained a military satellite of the U.S. In 1960, Japan's profile was increased with the signing of the highly controversial bilateral defense pact, which opened a third phase. Although Japan was included strategically in the global security and defense policies of the U.S., Tokyo also benefited from the alliance. It eliminated provisions allowing Washington to intervene in Japanese politics (to "*put down large-scale riots*"), provided a nuclear umbrella and obliged the U.S. to defend Japan if attacked, as well as to consult Tokyo for using military bases in Japan for U.S. military missions elsewhere (like in Vietnam).

As early as the 1970s, the U.S. government of *Nixon* and *Kissinger* sought to reduce U.S. overseas commitments in order to facilitate the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. The *Nixon-Doctrine* provided Japan with the opportunity to play a more "*autonomous*" diplomatic role within the basic U.S.-Japan security alliance. This culminated in *the National Defense Program Outline* in October 1976 and the November 1978 *Guidelines for the* U.S.*-Japan Defense Co-operation*. The first of these called for 60 anti-submarine warfare (ASW) ships, 16 submarines, 2 mine-sweeping flotillas and 16 ASW squadrons, supplemented by 220 aircraft. At that time, *Japan's Maritime Self-Defense Force* (*JMSDF*) started to undergo a major modernization, both in quantity and quality. In 1981, Japan and the U.S. discussed quietly and then stated publicly that Japan would expand its commitment to sea lane defense within 1,000 miles. The new "*burden-sharing*" allowed U.S. naval forces to concentrate on other roles and in other areas of the Pacific. However, over the next few years, a gap between the political commitment to adopt such a policy and the reality of Japan's efforts to attain the necessary capability continued to grow. But it was never a hollow Japanese promise, as U.S. naval experts confirmed in 1996: "*Judging by JMSDF improvements after 1990, Japan may well have*

exceeded expectations. Any further doubt as to the capacity of the JMSDF to perform this mission may be dispelled by a reexamination of naval forces in the Western Pacific."[12]

While Japan was also willing to pay an increasing share of the U.S. defense costs, it was technologically the most capable non-nuclear force in the region at the end of the Cold War. With Japan's increasing economic power, the bilateral security relationship entered a period of competition and rivalry until 1986. Since then, at least economically, the bilateral relationship appears to have been entering a new period on the basis of a more "*equal partnership*". However, this cannot be said of the bilateral security relationship. The nature of the "*patron-client relationship*" within the "*unequal alliance*" was to remain basically "*unequal*". While the U.S. has the treaty obligation to defend Japan, the latter has no defense obligation in circumstances where U.S. territory or U.S. troops in East Asia are attacked. However, similar to Japan's growing role in foreign policies, it has, since the beginning of the 1990s, gradually adopted a more visible defense posture within the bilateral alliance.

Given China's present objections and criticism of the U.S.-Japanese security alliance, it should be noted that China's view of the security alliance was not always so negative during the Cold War era. Beijing's security perception was not so much determined by the nature of the alliance *per se* than by its perception of the sources of threat to its security. During the 1970s and early 1980s, for instance, when both relationships with the U.S. and Japan had improved, it regarded the security alliance as a military counterweight to the perceived increasing Soviet military threat to China and in the Asia-Pacific region. Accordingly, it has seen the U.S. security alliances with Japan and South Korea not as inherently hostile to its security interests but rather as a stabilizing force in the new geopolitical structure in the region. Thus, the Chinese view has changed significantly over time from extreme hostility to high tolerance due to Beijing's geostrategic interests and assessment of the world balance of power, the quality of its own relationship to both powers, and the priorities of its national security interests, such as the implications for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.[13]

3. The New Security Environment in East Asia after the End of the Cold War

In the Cold War, the security landscape of the Asia-Pacific region was determined in large by the major powers - the United States, Russia, China and Japan. With the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, as well as the reduction of the U.S. military presence in the region, the roles of China, Japan, the United States, Taiwan, both Korean states and ASEAN countries are changing in accordance with the new fluid environment and "*new un-*

12 Woolley/Woolley (1996: 52).
13 See Wang/Wu (1998).

certainties". Apart from socio-economic security challenges, these "*new uncertainties*" can be summarized in the following way:

- unresolved historical border and territorial conflicts (like in the South China Sea);
- proliferation of ballistic missiles and nuclear, chemical and biological warheads as well as advanced conventional weapons[14];
- socio-economic and transnational security challenges (regionalisation and decentralisation in domestic policies, migration, environment, etc.);
- nationalist tendencies in domestic and foreign policies;
- China's growing economic, military and geopolitical weight.[15]

A perfect example how these "*new uncertainties*" are sometimes interlinked with each other can be seen in the dispute of the *Senkaku/Diaoyu* islands between China and Japan (see the following box). These events have underscored for neighboring countries such as ASEAN member states the uncertainties arising from the unpredictable transformation processes under way in China and lingering historical sentiments of Japan's political elite and society that can fuel unresolved conflicts and escalate these to a level where governments can lose the political control of events.

The Territorial conflict of Senkaku/Diaoyu-Islands

These islands are located about 200 km north of Taiwan and 300 km west of Japan's islands of *Okinawa*. They are disputed between Japan, China and Taiwan. Like other territorial disputes over islands, the *Senkaku Islands* are for legal, historical and geographical reasons problematic. Moreover, the sea around the *Senkaku Islands* might contain "*one of the largest oil and gas reservoirs in the world*" as a UN-report stated in 1968.[16] In 1972, Japan was given control of the *Senkaku Islands* by the United States, which had administered them along with *Okinawa* since the end of World War II. But *Washington* made clear at that time that administrative power does not mean sovereignty. Nonetheless, in 1977, *Tokyo* declared a 12-nm zone as fishing waters surrounding the islands. Since then, Taiwanese fishing boats have been obliged to stay outside the zone, which is secured by Japanese patrol boats.

In July 1996, Taiwan protested in an alliance with the PRC (!) and *Macao* against Japan's decision to include the islands in its 200-nm *Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)*. When Japan ratified the United Nations *Convention on the Law of the Sea* in June 1996 and the Japanese government approved its EEZ on 7 June 1996, announcing the decision to include the islands on 20 July 1996, Japanese rightwing and ultra-nationalist groups of the *Japan Youth Federation* erected a flag and lighthouse on one of the islets. The official reaction of the Japanese government was legalistic rather than political in nature, arguing that the lighthouse was erected privately by a Japanese citizen and therefore could not be removed. They could also find no legal reasons for ordering its removal.[17] Finally, Japan declared symbolically that it neither supports nor opposes the activities of private Japanese citizens.[18] Japanese rightists used the opportunity to push a view of Japan's legacy and future onto a

14 See Umbach (1998b, 1998e, 1999d and 2000a). To the impact of the financial and economic crisis on the arms build-up in the region - see Umbach (1998c and 1998d).

15 The World Bank has also rushed to conclusions that China's economy will surpass the United States by 2020 in terms of total economic output and total purchasing power - see The Korea Herald (henceforth TKH), (23 April 1997: 7), Die Welt (12 April 1997: 14 and 1 September 1997: 25).

16 See 'Rocks of Contention' (1996: 15).

17 See Soeya (1996).

18 The Japanese government declared to have no legal means of stopping the expeditions by Japanese extremists because the islands belong to Japanese individuals and so are private property. But characteristi-

weak coalition government that was divided over these issues and faced the further complication of forthcoming parliamentary elections in October 1996.

Taiwanese nationalists, in turn, appealed to Beijing that it should no longer use bellicose rhetoric or military force to intimidate Taiwan but should instead focus on "*its true rival*", Japan.[19] In *Hong Kong* and Taiwan, nationalists burned Japanese flags and demanded tough measures against Japan and the deployment of troops to the *Diaoyu Islands* in order to protect Chinese fishermen.[20] Consequently, after a year of mounting tensions between Taiwan and China, a (tactically) unusual, but also nationalist alliance of both Chinese states together with *Hong Kong* and *Macao* emerged out of the blue against Japan.[21] Students, veterans, fishermen and numerous political groups in China, Taiwan, *Hong Kong* and *Macao* had unified in an anti-Japanese sentiment by condemning the "*revival of Japanese militarism and aggression*". They started spontaneous protests day and night, targeting Japanese embassies, consulates and companies. Moreover, an orchestrated civilian landing of 300 activists from Taiwan, *Hong Kong* and *Macao*, aboard a 50-boat flotilla, displaying flags to assert Chinese sovereignty over the tiny East China Sea archipelago on some of the eight barren islets after outmaneuvering a naval cordon of 30 Japanese patrol boats, in October 1996 raised the very real danger of a violent clash with Japanese nationalists and regular Japanese patrol boats. Finally, the crisis culminated in the death of a *Hong Kong* activist who jumped off a protest ship, intending to assert China's rights over the islands.[22] Since that incident, both sides have been trying to settle the dispute diplomatically.[23]

The dispute has raised specific questions about a resurgent Chinese irredentist nationalism[24] which threatens China's ties with Asia's biggest economic power, Japan, as well as with ASEAN member states. Whilst both sides have repeatedly reiterated their principal positions on the island question, they have become slowly aware of the escalation potential over territorial disputes that threaten their governments" ability to control newly arising provocations by extreme nationalists as non-state actors on both sides.[25] Taiwan and Japan are also seeking to defuse the escalating row over the island's sovereignty and to focus on fishing rights and resources as well as untapped petroleum reserves around these islands.[26] But a real political solution for the disputed islands seems to be very far from the horizon.[27] In retrospect, "*the controversy might reflect a new dynamism within and across three Chinese territories, as well as in Sino-Japanese relations*", as *Yoshihide Soeya*, a well-known political scientist at Tokyo's *Keio-University*, speculated at that time.

---

cally for the inaction of the Japanese government, using it as election ammunition, it has not even approached the owners to find out their approval of the landing. See Ching (1996) and Kevin Sullivan/Mary Jordan, TKH (2 August 1996: 4) and idem, Financial Times (henceforth FT), (11 September 1996: 5).

19 See Virginia Sheng, The Free China Journal (26 July 1996: 1).

20 See International Herald Tribune (henceforth IHT), (13 September 1996: 4).

21 See also IHT (12 September 1996: 1 and 10) and ibid. (11 September 1996: 4), Nina Gerstenberg, Die Welt (11 September 1996: 7) and idem, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (henceforth FAZ), (21 September 1996: 3).

22 See IHT (24 September 1996: 1 and 8) and ibid. (27 September 1996: 4).

23 See ibid. (7-8 September 1996: 4 and 10); ibid. (10 September 1996: 4) and FT (24 September 1996: 14).

24 See also Forney (1996).

25 See also Ching, (1997).

26 To some extent, these bilateral Taipei-Tokyo talks are even more complicated than the China-Japan negotiations over the *Senkaku/Diaoyu* islands because the sovereignty issue is always complicated by cross-Straits-relations. Taiwan's four-point position is: insistence on sovereignty over the *Diaoyutais*, a rational attitude, no-Taipei-Beijing cooperation, and protection of Taiwan fishing rights - see Virginia Sheng, The Free China Journal (12 October 1996: 2).

27 See also Virginia Sheng, The Free China Journal (5 October 1996: 1).

Furthermore, Japan is now confronted with an increasing ballistic missile threat from China and North Korea, as the North Korean missile test of August 1998 demonstrated (see the following overview).[28]

Theater Ballistic Missiles Capable of Reaching Japan

Country	Name	Range (km)	Notes
Russia	Scud-B/C	300-500	Deployment details unknown
China	Dongfeng-21/CSS-5	1.800	Deployment details unknown
	Dongfeng-3/CSS-2	2.800	Being retired?
	Dongfeng-4/CSS-3	4.750	Deployment details unknown
	Dongfeng-21X	3.000	In development
	Dongfeng-25	1.800	In development
	Julang-1/CSS-N-3	1.700	SLBM (*Xia SSBN*)
North Korea	Scud C	500-650	Deployment details unknown
	No-Dong 1	1.000	At least 20+ deployed
	No-Dong 2	1.500+	in development
	Taepo-Dong 1	2.000	In development; tested in August 1998
	Taepo-Dong 2	4.000+	In development

Source: Umbach (1999c: 36).

Moreover, the significance of the South China Sea and open *Sea Lanes of Communication* (*SLOCs*) is crucial for the economic survival of Japan, as well as other North- and Southeast Asian nations.[29] More than one-third of the world's merchant ships sail through the Southeast Asia *SLOCs* and over 80 percent of Japan's oil imports reportedly pass through this region. No other major power in the world is probably so dependent as Japan on the import of raw materials and the export of finished goods to pay for them. With the encouragement of the United States and other Western powers, Japan has also widened the tasks and missions of its *Self Defense Forces* by contributing troops to the peacekeeping operations of the UN in limited roles (especially in Cambodia in 1991). The renewed security treaty with the United States in April 1996 and the negotiations to review the "*Guidelines for Defense Co-operation*" in 1978 are - despite all inherent problems and unresolved issues as we will see later - another indicator of Japan's gradually growing political role in East Asia. This is explained, *inter alia*, by the relative decline of American power and a relative rise of other powers in the region due

28 See also Umbach (1999b and 1999c).

29 See also Nishihara (1994a). To the internal debate in Japan see Hashimoto (1997); Noda (1997); Mochizuki (1995) and Baginda (1994).

to the evolution of a more pluralist structure of the international system after the end of the Cold War.

The other countries of the Asia-Pacific region, such as the ASEAN states, are in particular concerned about the triangular relationship between the major powers - the United States, China and Japan.[30] Any conflictual relationship between these powers might destabilize the region at large. While, in the last three years, ASEAN has seemed particularly alarmed about the U.S.-China relations, they now worry much more about the China-Japan relationship in the mid- and long-term. China and Japan have never been great powers simultaneously, whilst the emergence of a new great power has historically mostly been fraught with tensions in the region, as neighbors and other states see their share of international power diminished. Furthermore, both powers have no clearly articulated roles, whilst their bilateral relationship is hampered by considerable suspicion. If their mistrust increases, it might polarize and destabilize the Asia-Pacific region.

However, the public silence in most East Asian states in regard to the PRC during the Taiwan crisis in 1995-96 contrasted significantly with private relief at the demonstration of an American counterbalance to China, but with still remaining doubts about its durability. Other lingering disputes in the areas of human rights and China's non-proliferation policies (such as the export of ring magnets for nuclear weapons or *M-11* missiles to Pakistan) have plagued the U.S.-China relations, which have found their expression in the debates over renewing China's most-favored-nation trade status. Meanwhile, China's growing trade surplus, which has further increased by 20 per cent to almost $60 in 1998, has now surpassed that of Japan with the U.S.

Many of those new uncertainties in the post-Cold War era are primarily the result of globalization and rapidly changing internal and external factors which are difficult to forecast and draw adequate conclusions for domestic, foreign and defense policies. The Taiwan crisis of 1995-1996 and the current financial- and economic crisis in East Asia have underscored the new dimensions in an era of uncertainty and unpredictability. The immediate specter of the U.S.-China confrontation during the Taiwan crisis and the longer-term question of coping with China - as a military power, an economic competitor, an energy importer (with many foreign and security implications[31]) and a polluter - have posed broad and multiple challenges to the region and to global stability. Thus, China's missile firings during the Taiwan crisis in 1995-96 came dangerously close to major shipping lanes that violated another enduring vital American and Japanese security interest: freedom of navigation. Against the background of the Taiwan crisis and China's policy of using the instrument of armed forces for pursuing political objectives, the evolution of these new multilateral co-operation processes in the *ARF*, *CSCAP* and the *Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation* (*APEC*) and stability of the Asia-Pacific region still depends on the future national roles, missions and challenges within the triangular

30 See also Drifte (1999).

31 Calder (1997) and Umbach (2000b).

relationship among the United States, China and Japan.[32] Thus, the question of whether or not the three major powers can produce a stable and lasting co-operative relationship has still fundamental implications for the entire Asia-Pacific region. Characteristic for these uncertainties in the triangular relationship in general and the mutual mistrust between China and Japan in particular, one of the best security and defense experts in Japan, *Masashi Nishihara*, in 1994 argued:

> " ... Beijing seems to be pursuing contradictory policies. It wants to participate in multilateral economic and security arrangements in the Asia-Pacific region. At the same time, it is increasing its military power and trying to establish a militarily dominant position in Asia by taking advantage of the current situation when the United States and Russia have cut back their armed forces and defense budgets. One path is internationalist, the other nationalist. ...
>
> The region does not need a strong China. The evolution of the Chinese navy from a defensive coastal force into an offensive blue-water fleet would be destabilizing because it would change the balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region. This will happen if the Chinese economy continues to expand rapidly."[33]

4. Japan on the Way to Assuming a Greater Security Role in the Region?

The Taiwan crisis and the Chinese missile tests, as well as the *Senkaku-Diaoyu* islands dispute in 1995/1996 have heightened fears of a Chinese hegemony in Japan's political elite and public opinion. This has increased the potential for intense strategic competition - if not tension and hostility - between these two great powers whose history is characterized by underlying tensions, hostility and mutual distrust.[34] In this light, ASEAN's and Japan's interests in the South China Sea appear to converge since both have been alarmed by China's destabilizing activities in the area. Tokyo also agrees with the ASEAN states and the United States that China has to be engaged as an equal partner rather than to be contained. On the way to assuming a greater security role in Asia, however, Japan is facing many obstacles - domestically as well as externally, including its own economic crisis. [35]

Japan's lack of political leadership in the current economic recession also provides a striking picture to the LDP's new foreign policy concept, entitled "*Japan's Asia-Pacific Strategy - A Challenge for Change*", which demands a proactive rather than reactive foreign policy strategy to bring about "*positive changes*". In the view of the Japanese governments of recent years, a dual strategy focusing on both bi- and multilateralism presents no inherent dialectical contradiction. Japan's security and the peace, as well as stability in the Asia-Pacific region are

32 See Soh, The Straits Times (5 June 1997: 5), Dosch (1998) and Umbach (1998a).
33 Masashi Nishihara, IHT (12 July 1994).
34 See Yunling (1997), Harris (1997) and Green/Self (1996).
35 To these constraints see here once again Umbach (2000b).

portrayed rather as a "*two-wheeled cart*". According to the administrative vice-minister of Japan's *Defense Agency, Akiyama Masahiro* in August 1998:

> "One is the existence of bilateral alliances with the U.S., as exemplified by the U.S.-Japan security arrangements. The other is the promotion of confidence building through defense exchanges and security dialogues. Only when these two wheels are turning together can we make real progress toward increased peace and stability in the region."[36]

Characteristically for Japan's post-Cold War evolving foreign policies, this first conceptualized long-term foreign policy vision also envisaged a dual strategy of combined bi- and multilateralism. In the context of the bilateral security alliance with the U.S. and the new uncertainties of the region, the following goals can be identified as the most important factors of this foreign policy concept:

- the strengthened U.S.-Japanese alliance will promote peaceful change by deterring arms races and aggressive use of force and will be the final guarantor of Japan's security;
- promotion of multilateral security at the *ASEAN Regional Forum* and in Northeast Asia. Hence multilateral security co-operation is expected to complement (and not to replace) the U.S.-Japanese security alliance and so contribute to peaceful change;
- consolidation of supply and energy that is also indispensable for a "*positive sum change*" and
- dynamic alignment with other regions with a view to keeping the region open to the world.[37]

However, the implementation of these and other foreign policy goals is dependent on the political will and leadership of the Japanese governments, as well as on the domestic political consensus. As we will see later, there remain doubts about the ability of Japanese governments to implement these foreign policy objectives, as well as the agreed defense co-operation principles.[38] Nonetheless, the crisis on the Korean peninsula in 1994, when the U.S. was seriously considering preventive military strikes to destroy potential North Korean nuclear weapon systems and production factories on and below the soil, it became clear for both, Japan and the U.S., that Tokyo was politically unwilling and constitutionally unable to negotiate a solution or to give any military support during the crisis. For both sides, the crisis had a major impact on regional security and stability, and thus also to the future of the bilateral security alliance.

36 See the article of the administrative vice minister of the Defense Agency Akiyama Masahiro (1998a).
37 See Soeya (1997). This article refers only to the draft of the LDP's foreign policy guidelines.
38 See also Cronin (1996). He recommends that the U.S. government avoid asking Japan to do too much.

5. Shaping a New Security Alliance - Domestic Debates and Its Impact

In the view of many security experts inside and outside the region, the alliance has been threatened by several factors, including the following:

- a spill-over from economic conflict (i.e. the auto-trade and the U.S. trade deficit) that might erode the trust in the bilateral relationship[39];
- a greater military role of Japan that has raised some concerns not only in China[40];
- the asymmetric nature of the bilateral alliance;
- newly emerging security threats in the post-Cold War era which had not been previously addressed in the bilateral security alliance.

Against this background, experts as well as the public in both Japan and the United States began in 1995 to initiate a more intensive debate about the future of the U.S.-Japanese security alliance.

5.1 USA: Withdrawal or Engagement in the Asia-Pacific Region? - The Nye-Johnson Controversy

After the end of the Cold War, the United States painfully recognized its enormous social and economic problems. In the absence of an evident threat, the first *Clinton* administration began to give priority to restoring economic competitiveness at home and promoting traditional values of democracy and human rights overseas in the wider concept of economic interdependence. But in general, it lacked an all-embracing foreign policy vision for the new post-Cold War era. Without a clear strategic rationale and vision, however, U.S. policy has, in recent years, been largely at the mercy of competing single-issue groups in domestic U.S. politics, covering a wide spectrum including human rights, proliferation and trade. In the view of the Chinese political elite, however, U.S. policy is viewed not as an incoherent process (which it often really is), but rather as a strategy for keeping China weak and divided, rejecting its status as a great power and the legitimacy of the political and ideological regime in Beijing. Whether it is criticism of nuclear testing or military modernization, threats of sanctions over intellectual property rights or a tough U.S. stance on China's entry into the World trade organization, they are all perceived and interpreted as part of the U.S "*containment strategy*" to keep China weak.

Nonetheless, the U.S. domestic discussions and the new post-Cold War environment have called for a transformation of *Pax Americana* in Europe and Asia. They have forced the U.S. and Japanese government to redefine the structuring of the bilateral security alliance, as well as Japan's regional and international role which seems to undermine the alliance. At the same

39 To the background see Kreft (1995).

40 See, for example, IHT (19 April 1996: 4), Michael Richardson, IHT (14 May 1996: 4) and TKH (18 April 1996: 4).

time, Japan's growing international role and the need to reduce the U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific have also become, ironically, new imperatives for the continuation of the U.S.-Japan security alliance and a *Pax Americana* in the wider Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. role as "*balancer*" and "*broker*" in Asia is – as in Europe - still necessary in the post-Cold War era. Given the still existing mistrust towards Japan in other Asian states and increasing nuclear proliferation threats in the region and elsewhere, the U.S. is continues as a *"cap in the bottle"* against the military resurgence of Japan, armed with nuclear weapons.[41]

In this light, Assistant Secretary of Defense *Joseph Nye* in 1995 launched a new effort to refocus *Clinton's* Japan policy away from singular contentious trade issues towards renewing the security relationship. In the view of *Nye*, "*Security is like oxygen - you tend not to notice it until you begin to lose it, but once that occurs there is nothing else that you will think about*."[42] Accordingly, the U.S. is still needed for maintaining political order and a security framework that will sustain economic growth. The *U.S. Security Strategy for the East Asia Pacific Region*, released in February 1995, spelled out in detail the new U.S. strategy of engagement in the region and underlined the need for a forward-based troop presence of 100,000 U.S.-troops in East Asia. The central objectives of the new U.S. strategy are to foster political stability, maintain access to regional markets, ensure freedom of navigation, and prevent the rise of any hostile inclinations or the development of a policy of aggression towards other nations. It also reflects the economic importance of Asia for the U.S. The region now accounts for more than 40 per cent of U.S. trade - over half a trillion dollars annually. For each of the past five years, U.S. exports to Asia have increased an average of 13 per cent. In order to initiate crisis response, deterrence, reassurance, and influence, a proper mix of forward-deployed forces, pre-positioned equipment, and military interaction is, in the view of U.S. defense experts, still needed. [43]

For the U.S. revisionist *Chalmers Johnson*, however, only "*an end to Japan's protectorate status will create the necessary domestic political conditions for Japan to assume a balanced security role in regional and global affairs.*"[44] In his view, it is not China but the U.S. which represents East Asia's greatest security threat in that it "*continues to distrust Japan"s ability to act as a true ally.*"[45] Two years later, he still criticized the "*artificial prolonging of the Cold War in East Asia*" which "*keeps the Japanese people from seriously debating such topics as their American-imposed constitution, their responsibilities toward peacekeeping operations around the world, and making clear to the whole world who is actually in charge of the country's more-or-less camouflaged military establishment.*"[46] In this light, he has repeatedly

41 To trust and mistrust in Japan's non-nuclear weapon status and increasing regional as well as global proliferation threats of nuclear weapons see Umbach (2000a).
42 Nye (1995: 91).
43 See also Flamm (1998).
44 Johnson (1995: 107).
45 Ibid. (110).
46 Johnson (1996: 29).

favored the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Japan in general and Okinawa in particular. Together with isolationists and sinocentric Asian strategists, revisionists like *Chalmers Johnson* have thus increasingly criticized the U.S.-Japanese security alliance, Japan's "*free riding*" on the alliance and any U.S. military entanglement in Asia. But hitherto, those critics of the U.S.-Japanese security alliance still represent a minority in the U.S. strategic community.

5.2 Japan: Defining Collective Security and a Mutual Security Alliance

The benefits of the U.S.-Japan alliance in the Cold War did not come without costs. The U.S. geopolitical strategy in the Asia-Pacific after the World War Two had encouraged the reinstatement of pre-war politicians (including war criminals). This created divisions between progressive and conservative forces in Japan's domestic politics. One of the results of this historical legacy after World War II was and continues to be the country's (in)ability to deal with sensitive issues concerning its military and pre-war history. Thus *Nicholas D. Kristof* has argued:

> "The danger remains ... that Japan will recover its nerve before it fully confronts the past. Already Japan grows more assertive in foreign relations and slowly rearms. Many young Japanese express disgust for the weakness of their government and want Japan to become a normal military power. Should that happen before East Asia achieves better mutual understanding, the region will become a much more dangerous neighborhood."[47]

Furthermore, an increasing number of experts and observers in Japan and the United States have become critical of Japan's "*free-riding*" or the "*defense burden*" the U.S. security alliance has placed on Japan. Pacifist forces thus criticize the U.S.-Japan alliance as another form of militarisation and deny the need for a nuclear umbrella.[48] Instead of a bilateral security alliance with the United States, they are now demanding peaceful foreign and security policies in the light of the historical burdens of Japan's militaristic policies prior to 1945.

While the international community might recognize that a forceful response to a violation of the UN Charter does not conflict with the charter's own ban on force, the Japanese government has maintained its own views on what constitutes an illegal use of force and has used such broad, generalized definitions to justify its non-participation. The same "*exceptionalism*" can be seen in the official positions it takes on collective self-defense. While asserting that Japan, like all other countries, has an inherent right to collective defense, the government has claimed that the constitutional ban on force precludes it from exercising this right and thus participating in collective-security actions, even under the umbrella of the UN. If Japan is to contribute to the stability and security of Asia in the future, however, Tokyo needs to clarify its attitude on whether it is able to exercise its right of collective self-defense and, as a consequence, to expand its support to the U.S. in times of emergency.

---

47 Kristof (1998: 48).

48 See, for instance, Kaneko (1996).

The solidity and effectiveness of U.S.-Japan military co-operation until very recently had many gaps, as the Gulf War 1990/1991 and the crisis on the Korean peninsula in 1994 revealed. At the time, Japanese officials dithered for weeks over whether to allow transit rights for U.S. troops in the event of a Korean confrontation. Most of these problems had to do with contingency matters - the heart of any defense planning. Until that time, the main document of U.S.-Japan contingency planning had been the 1978 *Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Co-operation,* which should have harmonized the relationship. However, many contingencies involving conflicts in the region around Japan had not been addressed at all, though conflicts on the Korean peninsula (particularly North Korea's ballistic missiles) have posed a direct threat to Japan. Furthermore, many of the efforts addressed in the *1978 Guidelines* simply did not work, as the "*Ominato*"-incident illustrated. The *Japanese Self-Defense Forces (SDF)* were forbidden to re-supply American troops, even with ammunition should they run out. And, despite the fact that Japan has one of the largest helicopter fleets in the world, there existed no arrangement giving armed forces access to these in the event of emergency evacuations, as was the case after the *Kobe* earthquake in January 1995. Air controllers unions have traditionally been distinctly anti-military and have repeatedly resisted letting military planes use any runway it supervises. At the time, there was also no guarantee of priority use of major civilian airports to SDF or U.S. forces in a military emergency, nor did there exist any plan for full scale mobilization or legal authority to use roads or cross private property. Even worse, Japan's political decision-making processes reflect the normative context of a policy biased strongly against a forceful articulation of military security. *Japan's Defense Agency* is thus deeply entrenched in inter-ministerial arrangements which, however, often lack an effective co-ordinating mechanism with a Prime Minister who has little control over the Cabinet Secretariat and Ministries.[49] In 1995, for instance, only one official was entitled to consult with the Prime Minister in the event of an emergency. Consequently, Prime Minister *Murayama* was left to sleep through the morning hours after the disastrous earthquake in *Kobe*. At the same time, the *Kobe* mayor resisted the request from a divisional commander in *Kobe* to use the support of the SDF forces with their appropriate technical equipment. His permission was a legal requirement.[50] Furthermore, a U.S. offer to provide an aircraft carrier as a floating hospital was mulled over for days and weeks and then dropped as hundreds died. At the same time, other foreign ships with technical and medical equipment were held up outside the port because they had no notification by the port authority. Offers of blankets from foreign nations were turned down because it might appear that regal Japan was taking handouts from lesser nations. As a result, these circumstances were the cause of many unnecessary deaths.

Meanwhile, Japan was confronted with U.S. demands for a greater burden-sharing and supporting the U.S. military presence in Asia. However, most of these pressures or accusa-

---

49 To the institutional structure of Japan's decision-making processes in security policy see Katzenstein/Okawara (1993: 21ff.).

50 See Mosher (1997: 4).

tions that Japan is "*free-riding*" on the U.S., were and continue to be unfounded. There are, at present, 45,000 U.S. military personnel based in Japan. Half of this number comprises a division of marines stationed in Okinawa. The U.S. Seventh Fleet which covers the western Pacific and the Indian Ocean has its command headquarters and supply and maintenance facilities based in Japan. These U.S. armed forces play a crucial role, not only for the defense of Japan, but also for the whole of Asia and particularly for the defense of South Korea. Japan also provides extensive support, termed *Host Nation Support* (*HNS*), to facilitate the bilateral security arrangement. It also covers labor costs for staff employed by the U.S. military, as well as the costs of electricity, gas, water, and other utilities. In 1995, these amounted to $6.2 billion or 75 per cent of the total expenses for keeping the U.S. military stationed in Japan. [51]

6. Forward to the Past? - The Negotiation Process of the Re-Defined U.S.-Japanese Security Alliance

6.1 On the Way to the Re-defined Security Treaty of April 1996

The unlikely coalition government between the pacifist *Social Democratic Party of Japan* (*SDPJ*) and the conservative *Liberal Democratic Party* (*LDP*), as well as domestic preoccupations did not bode very well in 1995 for the re-definition of the security alliance or any foreign-policy crisis management. Furthermore, it was a difficult year for Japanese diplomats due to the fifthieth anniversaries of the end of the Second World War. Thus the "*unholy*" government coalition was torn between the anti-war resolution of the SDJP, which included a forthright apology for Japan's wartime atrocities, and the LDP's and particularly its new leader, *Hashimoto's*, collaboration with Japanese veterans' associations. Moreover, *Hashimoto* was, in the first part of 1995, still *Minister of International Trade and Industry*, well-known for his uncompromising stand towards U.S. demands in an increasingly difficult economic relationship (especially in the car parts negotiations) between these two countries.

In the second half of 1995, the focus of the bilateral relationship shifted to the security relationship. The renewing process of the bilateral security alliance between the U.S. and Japan suffered a major setback when the rape of a 12-year old girl in *Okinawa* by three American serviceman in September 1995 spurred widespread resentment and controversy in Japan as well as, at least partly, in the United States. The rape caused the most serious crisis in the bilateral security alliance with massive protests against the security treaty's revision in 1960. Large-scale demonstrations demanded the removal of all bases from *Okinawa*. The governor of *Okinawa, Masahide Ota*, was totally opposed to any U.S. security commitment in Japan

51 See also Sakurada (1998).

and *Okinawa*, refused to sign documents requiring landowners to extend the bases' leases. At the same time, the long-life pacifist leader of the SDPJ, who in the past had led the fight against the U.S.-Japanese security alliance and became the head of the coalition government, *Tomiichi Murayama*, was obliged to argue for its maintenance and adopt a crisis management for its own party, the shaky coalition government and a damage limitation for the Okinawa affair. Moreover, the rape of the 12-year old girl resulted in new debates within Japan as to its status as a still existing protectorate of the United States, given the very limited Japanese authority to arrest U.S. servicemen. At the time, an unraveling of the alliance seemed to be a distinct possibility. Thus the U.S. Commander of Forces in the Pacific, *Richard C. Macke*, was forced to resign after he heated up tensions by arguing that the men should have paid for sex instead of committing rape.[52] Although a new minor revision to the *Status-of-Forces Agreement*, which has given Japanese authorities more rights to arrest U.S. servicemen suspected of crimes, was indeed reached, the discussions of a renewed security treaty remained very difficult under the existing circumstances of domestic politics, both in Japan and in the United States. Both governments had to persuade and convince their public opinion of the need for the alliance after the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, the affair raised difficult and sensitive questions about the future of the U.S. military presence in Okinawa, where the bulk of some 60,000 U.S. troops in Japan are based, and the political-cultural ties between *Tokyo* and *Okinawa* as a scheduled U.S.-Japanese summit approached in late 1995. In the end, the Okinawa crisis helped to open up a debate over Japan's future defense policies which had for many years been almost a taboo subject. Meanwhile, domestic pressures forced Clinton to reschedule his trip to Asia for April 1996.

In the interim, the U.S. and Japanese bureaucracies sought to placate Okinawans with the offer of returning an air base, two communications facilities, a port and other military properties to Okinawa officials and relocating key facilities elsewhere in Japan. The offer of U.S. and Japanese bureaucracies, however, failed not only in the negotiation with Okinawa's administration chief, *Masahide Ota*, but also in the refusal of other regions in Japan to accept military installations and bases transferred from Okinawa. While the solution for the military bases in Okinawa can only be found in decreasing the burden upon Okinawan residents, a total closure of the U.S. bases is, in the foreseeable future, neither feasible nor realistic. With the closure of the *Clark* and *Subic Bay* bases in the Philippines in 1992, and new security challenges for Japan arising from the south, Okinawa's geostrategic value has increased in the Post-Cold War era for both Japan and the United States.

In order to understand the Okinawans anger it is necessary to mention that it has to host 60 per cent of the 47,000 U.S. troops stationed in Japan and more than 75 per cent of the U.S. military facilities in Japan on an island that occupies less than 1 per cent of the country's total territory. Meanwhile, despite very difficult negotiations between Tokyo and local authorities,

52 See Mainichi Daily News (21 November 1995: 2).

the *Yamaguchi* prefecture agreed to transfer to the U.S. military base in *Iwakuni* the *KC-130 Hercules* aircraft refueling planes presently stationed at the *Futenma Air Station* on Okinawa. But the relocation of the *Futenma's* base heliport operations, which primarily involve *U.S. Marine Corps* training, became a major stumbling block in the *Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO)*, which was established to deal with relocation questions. Finally, both sides agreed to build a sea-based, floating facility off the coast of the main Okinawan island.

Back in 1996, the Taiwan crisis and China's missile tests just 60km from the Japanese island of *Yonaguni*, on which about 1,700 Japanese live, seemed to confirm everyone's worst fears. But the two aircraft carriers sent to the waters off Taiwan helped to reassure the widespread doubts in East Asia that the United States would not allow the balance of power to be overturned by force. In the end, it also helped the U.S. and Japan to reaffirm their bilateral security treaty, which commits America to the defense of Japan, and agreed to look for ways to increase Japan's contribution to regional security. An opinion poll in a leading Japanese newspaper revealed that 70 per cent of Japanese people supported the alliance with the U.S. But at the same time, the poll also indicated that 67 per cent favored a reduction in the number of U.S. military bases.[53]

As early as November 1995, the Japanese government adopted a new *National Defense Program Outline* with corresponding national defense guidelines to broaden the responsibilities to cope with the new challenges and realities in three main fields: (1) defending Japan; (2) responding to large-scale disasters and various other situations; and (3) contributing to the construction of a more stable security environment.[54] It was *de facto* another step forward to "*collective defense*" which all Japanese governments had hitherto interpreted as constitutionally forbidden. Simultaneously, Japan's *Self-Defense Forces* underwent a major military reform that included the creation of a rapid-reaction force, the redeployment of some divisions to more southerly islands of Japan, provision of the defense budget for a new anti-missile defense system under the theatre missile defense program and the acquisition of other advanced weapon systems. A gradual revolution of Japan's security and defense policies was thus under way.

The *Clinton-Hashimoto* summit in April 1996 deepened and reaffirmed the U.S. security relationship in a joint declaration as "*essential for preserving peace and stability*" in the Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. also renewed its former commitment to maintain about 100,000 troops in Asia and not to reduce its presence in Japan. At the same time, the Japanese government went further and pledged a more active Japanese defense role in the region. It agreed to expand logistical support for U.S. forces in peacetime. The so-called *Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement*, signed few days before the *Clinton-Hashimoto* Summit, reinforced the *Joint Security Agreement* through more substantial co-operation between the two forces in rear areas, including the supply of fuel to U.S. aircraft by the *Self-Defense Forces*

53 See Hosokawa (1998: 2).

54 See the article of the administrative vice minister of the Defense Agency, Akiyama Masahiro (1998a: 3).

(*SDF*), which was formerly not permitted under most circumstances.[55] It also signed an agreement to intensify contingency planning and to review guidelines for defense co-operation, not only if Japan were attacked, but also in the event of crisis in areas "*surrounding Japan*". After 17 months of bilateral work following the *Joint Declaration on Security* of April 1996, the *U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee*, composed of Foreign and Defense ministers of two governments (commonly called "*2+2*"), approved and released the *Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Co-operation*. It describes different co-operations between the two governments, as well as their armed forces, basically in three categories (see also the overview of the guidelines as an annex of the paper): (1) co-operation under normal circumstances, (2) actions in response to an armed attack against Japan, and (3) co-operation in "*situations in areas surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan's peace and security*". Hence, in contrast to the *1978 Guidelines*, focusing on bilateral defense co-operation at "*Japan contingency*", the new *Guidelines* of September 1997 address more regional security challenges of Japan (such as those from the Korean peninsula and potential instability in the Taiwan Strait or the South China Sea).

Both sides agreed that Japan might in future play a more active role in co-operation with U.S. forces in regional crises on the Korean peninsula or over Taiwan. It would also be able to take part in intelligence sharing, mine-sweeping operations, to join naval patrols monitoring sanctions and to use its navy in search and rescue operations, evacuation of its own nationals caught up in a crisis, whilst U.S. forces can make use of facilities in Japan, including civilian ports and airports. However, the use of Japanese combat troops is still ruled out whilst other questions (such as delivering weapon systems and ammunition to U.S. armed forces in crisis or military conflict) remain open to controversial interpretations of the newly defined *Guidelines*.

6.2 The Guideline Discussion Inside and Outside of Japan

The new guidelines are motivated to "*articulate the modality of Japan-U.S. defense cooperation in response to the new security environment after the Cold War*" and "*to add more relevance to the Japan-U.S. security arrangements in the post-Cold War environment*" by strengthening their mutual defense cooperation in specific situations.[56] The expansion of the security parameter, vaguely described as "*areas surrounding Japan*" also includes the protection of *Sea Lanes of Communication* (*SLOCs*) and thereby, possibly, the Taiwan Strait and the South China Sea, where both the U.S. and Japan have a critical interest in insuring free passage of the sealanes. Besides the economically critical *SLOCs* for Japan, some Japanese experts, such as *Toshiya Hoshino*, see additional reasons for Japan to defend open *SLOCs*: " ... *the violation of an internationally accepted principle cannot and should not be easily com-*

55 See also Hijiri Inose, The Nikkei Weekly (18 March 1996: 23).
56 Masahiro (1998b: 8).

promised for fear of undermining its relevance in host of other future instances."[57] According to his argumentation, the U.S.-Japan alliance is not directed against any country as its target nor it is an intention to contain China. The *Guidelines of Defense Co-operation* are basically and "*primarily reactive measures to an action that would alter the status quo to the negative direction*."[58] However, it is also clear that the actions anticipated in the *Guidelines* cannot be ruled out for conflicts in the Taiwan Straits or the South China Sea "*if the adversarial situations were actually triggered against the pledge of resolving the matter peacefully and thus in a manner significantly affecting Japan's peace and security*."[59]

Not surprisingly, these guidelines have been criticized in Beijing and other East Asian capitals. In Beijing, they have been perceived as further evidence of the U.S. containment and a remilitarization of Japan's *Self-Defense Forces*. That criticism reflects growing tensions between China and the United States, as well as between Beijing and Tokyo. Furthermore, Japan announced a freeze of its grand aid in response to China's continued nuclear testing in 1995 and 1996 (although the diplomatic "*assertiveness*" of Tokyo was in reality quite limited, and indeed one of a double standard, in contrast to Japan's protests against the nuclear testing of France which provoked widespread anger among the public and street demonstrations even with the participation of Japanese government officials and *Diet* representatives). The confirmation that a military conflict between China and Taiwan would inevitably mean a crisis occurring in the areas surrounding Japan (that are subject to the new defense co-operation guidelines), made by Chief Cabinet Secretary *Seiroku Kajiyama* in a statement issued on August 17, 1997, contributed to an even more strained relationship between China and Japan.[60]

However, in Taiwan and most of the other East Asian countries, the new guidelines are seen rather in a positive light because of the stabilizing effect on the wider Asia-Pacific region or with some ambivalence because of the deeper mistrust in Japan's security and defense policies (as in South Korea).[61] In these cases, however, the U.S. and Japan have explained the reasons and implications and thus both sides have demonstrated their will to enhance transparency, which has largely been successful (with the exception of China and North Korea).

7. The Future of the Bilateral Security Alliance: Remaining Problems and the Gap between Expectations and Reality

Japan is still facing problems on both fronts - domestically and externally - to implement the *Guidelines of Defense Co-operation* and to live up to its agreed security obligations. At the same time, it seems that both sides have talked past each other. While Washington has sought

57 Hoshino (1997: 3).
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid.
60 See Minoru Tada, TKH (5 September 1997: 6).
61 To Taiwan see Neilan (1998).

confirmation of what Tokyo will or will not do to assist the United States in the event of a crisis, Japan has tried to find out through debate what it can or cannot do under its constitution. Most worrisome, however, it is the considerable gap between expectations and reality on both sides of the redefined U.S.-Japan security alliance that may produce fallout in the next crisis. In this context, the question is still open to what extent Japan is really prepared to perform certain military missions that fall into the grey zone due to the uncertainty surrounding the constitutionality of the roles. The present socio-economic and political crisis in East Asia and Japan has further strained the bilateral relationship and the pacifist roots are still strong in the Japanese society and political life. In countering Chinese accusations of a renewed Japanese militarism and in striking contrast to Japan's presumed ability to a formulate a growing defense posture, *Nicholas D. Kristof* stated at the end of 1998:

> "In 1998, this fear of Japan, though deeply felt [in China and elsewhere in East Asia], is wholly misplaced. The most pacifist of countries, Japan is kept to shaken and frail by its wartime legacy that it will be incapable of aggression for decades to come. Not only do its neighbors not trust Japan; Japan does not trust itself. The country is still incapable of mounting a meaningful security policy. Surveys show that only 46 percent of the public favor using force to defend Japan against invasion by another country. It may be unfair to blame all Japan for the weakness of diplomats like *Yasushi Akashi*, the former U.N. envoy to Yugoslavia. But his inability to countenance force as an instrument of policy is typical of many Japanese officials. And just as *Akashi's* distaste for violence led to disaster in the Balkan's, where it resulted in the murder of thousands of civilians, so Asia and America will suffer from Japan's inability to contribute to regional security."[62]

7.1 External Considerations

In the past, the policy of maintaining good relations with China and the U.S. was the only option for Japan. In the future, too, Japan cannot pursue a real independent strategy backed by national military power. At the same time, it is no longer possible to be a "*civilian power*" alone (*Hanns Maull*[63]) as was the case in the past, as this will neither be tolerated by the United States nor other countries inside and outside the region. In recent years, however, Chinese suspicion of the U.S.-Japanese alliance has gradually intensified.[64] In the Chinese view, the U.S.-Japanese security alliance should neither be too tense nor grow too strong and expand. This logic follows China's traditional balance of power policies. At the same time, they continue to see, even after the newly defined bilateral security alliance, many potential risks. However, as private conversations with Chinese experts and diplomats often reveal, they recognize the fact that the only military alternative to a security alliance for Japan would be nationalism and hence a remilitarization of Japan's defense policies, which is certainly not in the Chinese security interest. Even more controversial for Beijing is Japan's intention to deploy, together with the United States, a *Theater Missile Defense* (*TMD*) system, after North Korea

62 Kristof (1998b: 43f.).
63 Maull (1991)

tested a three-staged *Taepo-dong 1* missile at the end of August 1998. The test, which caused surprise even in U.S. intelligence circles, indicated that North Korea has now acquired the advanced technology to become in the next few years the fourth country - after the U.S., Russia and China - with an operational land-based, intercontinental missile capability. Confronted with this Korean missile and potential nuclear capability, the test changed significantly Japan's short-term security perceptions and defense policies.[65] Thus, in November 1998, for instance, after considering such a capability for nearly a decade, Japan's government approved the plan to launch four reconnaissance satellites by the spring of 2003. [66]

These defense policy decisions of Japan have raised numerous objections from the Chinese side since a TMD system is seen by the Chinese as overtly hostile threat which might lead to an open arms race between China and Japan. Furthermore, the U.S. and Japan are exaggerating the military threat of missile attacks from North Korea (not to speak about China's nuclear missile threat) and using it as a pretext to strengthen its military alliance and enhance a military presence in Asia which Beijing views as obsolete. Moreover, an effective TMD-option of the U.S. and its main allies in East Asia against China's nuclear missiles would not only question its nuclear deterrence against potential aggressors but also dramatically increase U.S. capabilities to launch a disarmaning strike against China. Consequently, China is - like Russia - essentially interested in the endorsement of the principles behind the *ABM*-treaty.[67] Furthermore, if Japan were to prefer a naval TMD-option, based, *inter alia*, on its *Aegis*-class destroyers, then even Taiwan might benefit from such a naval-based TMD umbrella. And indeed, the only thing that alarms Beijing more than TMD being deployed in Japan is TMD being deployed in Taiwan - possibly together with the U.S. and Japan. However, most of these Chinese arguments are not very convincing or persuasive if one analyses those counter-argumentations more in detail.[68]

For the first time since the end of World War II, Japanese diplomacy has increasingly faced the real challenge of balancing relations with Washington and Beijing and applying its own independent judgement. This already presented a basic dilemma for Japanese foreign policy when *Hashimoto* traveled to Beijing in September 1997 in order to improve and consolidate relations with China. Apart from the historical repercussions of Japan's inability to admit to its historical guilt, the Taiwan question was of fundamental importance during *Hashimoto*'s visit in China. For the Chinese government, the question of whether or not Taiwan has been drafted into *"situations they may emerge in the areas of surrounding Japan and which will have an important influence on the peace and security of Japan"* (according to *the Guidelines of Defense Co-operation* between Washington and Tokyo), dominated the discus-

64 See Bjiang (1996), Feng (1997) and Garrett/Glaser (1997).
65 Umbach (1999a, 1999b and 1999c).
66 See Nicholas D. Kristof, IHT (7-8 November 1998: 1) and Robert Karniol, Jane's Defence Weekly (18 November 1998: 14).
67 See Umbach (1999c).
68 See Umbach (1999c: 37f.).

sions and comments in the Chinese media. According to these *Guidelines*, the official position of the U.S. and Japanese government was always unequivocal – "*areas surrounding Japan*" is a "*situational, not a geographical concept*" as was already stipulated in the *Guidelines*. Understandably, this official interpretation has never satisfied the Chinese government. And indeed, this kind of deterrence follows Washington's concept of "*strategic ambiguity*" towards China and other security challenges in the region.[69]

It reflects, once again, the importance of stability in the triangular relationship. Although China is Japan's second-largest trading partner after the United States, while Japan ranks first in China's foreign trade and an increasing number of visitors travel between the two countries (which increased from 10,000 in 1972 to 1.1 million in 1995) as well as of Chinese students (account for 45 per cent of all foreign students)[70], the growing economic interdependence has so far not changed the deep mistrust both countries have towards each other and their conflictual strategic interests.[71] Both sides still hinder a fundamental *rapprochement*. Furthermore, additional problems and conflicts may arise in the near future.[72] Thus, the Taiwan issue might become even more problematic in the China-Japan relationship since Taiwan's continuing democratization of its political system has gained increasing praise within the Japanese population and media. In a striking contrast, Beijing's popularity, according to public opinion polls, reached historically its lowest level in Japan after World War II. Looking into the future, the younger Japanese generation is less fearful than their elders of offending China and cares less about historical grievances, partly also as a result of its failing education in Japan's history of colonizing and brutalizing East Asia by the Imperial Japanese military before and during World War II. Hence, a domestic policy shift in Japan's future stance towards China cannot be excluded. In China, too, the improvement of the bilateral relationship reflects merely the surface. A Chinese opinion poll in December 1996 indicated that Chinese under the age of 40 overwhelmingly said that Japan wanted to become a military superpower again, and that the first thing they thought of in connection with Japan was the rape of *Nanjing*.[73]

---

69 See Robinson (1996: 7).

70 See Mainichi Daily News (2 April 1997).

71 See also Isaka, The Nikkei Weekly (14 August 1995).

72 Despite an absence of formal diplomatic ties between Taiwan and Japan, business links and people-to-people exchanges have remarkably increased. In 1997, Taiwan travelers to Japan exceeded 850,000. Recently, the Japanese government recognized the validity of Taiwanese passports and has resumed 72-hour visa-free privileges for visitors from Taiwan. The Japanese Foreign Ministry informed Beijing in advance to assure Beijing that it was a procedural change that in no way will affect Japan's *One-China policy*. Furthermore, Taiwan's *EVA Airways*, which has linked up with *Air Nippon Kabushiki*, began daily flights between Taipei and Osaka that has broken the ban on Taiwan-based airlines to that city. Taiwan airlines are also banned from the main Tokyo International Airport at *Narita*. They can only fly into and from Tokyo's *Haneda*-airport, which is mainly used for domestic flights. But the *Haneda* airport facilities have been expanded in order to allow a number of international flights. *Haneda*, however, is much closer to downtown Tokyo than is *Narita* which gives Taiwan travelers some advantages to those coming from mainland China - to these an other examples of growing ties between Japan and Taiwan see Neilan (1998).

73 See Don Oberdorfer, TKH (20 June 1997: 6).

China and Japan indeed see the future of Asian security in profoundly different ways, as the disappointing visit of *Jiang Zemin* in Tokyo in November 1998 demonstrated. He couldn't get what he most wanted: a strongly worded apology passed as a parliamentary resolution and a direct statement on the "*three no's*" (no to an independence of Taiwan, no to two Chinas and no to Taiwan's participation in any international organizations in which statehood is a pre-condition), including barring Taiwan's entry into international organizations such as the WTO. While Japan has no problem to conform to a one-China policy and with excluding Taiwan from the UN, it supports Taiwan membership - in contrast to Clinton's statement on the "*three no's*" made during his Beijing visit in July 1998[74] - in other organizations, particularly economic ones. [75]

But also in other Asian countries, ambivalent feelings still exist. This ambivalence, however, has not so much to do with the strengthening of the bilateral security alliance between Washington and Tokyo itself which will contribute to stability on the Korean peninsula or in the South China Sea. But South Koreans, for instance, remain cautious about an increasing military role of Japan whilst ASEAN states remain sensitive to China's reaction and concerned about the nature of the bilateral relationship between China and Japan or China and the U.S.[76]

Moreover, since the economic crisis, mistrust on both sides of the security alliance has complicated the bilateral relationship. Clinton's engagement policy towards China and the proclamation of a "*constructive strategic partnership*" with China has "alarmed *Taiwan, unsettled longtime U.S. allies Japan and South Korea, and prodded India to unveil its nuclear program*" as *Ted Galen Carpenter* and other critical U.S. experts have criticized.[77] Indeed, Clinton's decision to bypass Tokyo after he returned from Beijing in July 1998 (reportedly, on Beijing's insistence) and the insensitivity of renewed U.S. "*Japan bashing*" vis-à-vis its failing economic reform policies whilst at the same time unreservedly praising China's economic reform policies (although it is still largely a state-directed economy), its intention not to devalue its currency and, by taking measures to stabilize the region economically as well as by describing China as something similar to an "*island of stability*", were seen as foolishly shortsighted, counterproductive and failing to understand the complexities and psychologies of Japan's domestic policies and the wider geopolitical, as well as geostrategic, implications of these policies. While Tokyo thus feels used and abused by Washington, the U.S. is thus playing into the hands of anti-American advocates at a time when China barely conceals its intention to weaken the U.S.-Japanese security alliance. As one observer noted, it was "*the first*

74 See Baum et al. (1998) and Wachman (1998).

75 See also Lawrence (1998) and Baum (1998).

76 See also Kristof (1998); 'East Asian Views of the Japan-U.S. Defense Guidelines. Asia-Pacific Journalists Meeting 1997' (1998); and Umbach (2000b).

77 Galen Carpenter (1998); Gerald Segal, IHT (20 November 1998: 20); Tom Plate, ibid. (2-3 May 1998:6), William Pfaff ibid. (18 June 1998: 9); Ralph A. Cossa ibid. (22 September 1998: 10), Breer (1998) and McDewitt (1998).

time since World War II that the U.S. and China had joined together in publicly criticizing Japan."[78] Hence the perception of a U.S.-Chinese condominium that delivers South and East Asia over to a Chinese geostrategic sphere of interest has undermined the influence of the U.S. and its engagement policies in these parts of the world. At the same time, Japan has become suddenly more distrustful of U.S. policy, which seems cozying too close to China. In the light of "*Japan's Depression Diplomacy*", *Yoichi Funabashi* noted at the end of 1998: "*This downgrading of U.S.-Japan ties is particularly painful because it violates the highest virtue in Japanese society, loyalty. Once an alliance is entered, it is not subject to negotiation, justification, or competition from a third party. The perceived betrayal strengthens Japanese advocates of a "burdenless alliance".*"[79]

Meanwhile, the U.S. is beginning to recognize its shortsighted policy vis-à-vis Tokyo and is now trying to repair and restore the bilateral relationship (as, for instance, the last visit of Japan's Prime Minister *Obuchi* in Washington demonstrated)[80] but uncertainties remain as *Michael Jonathan Green* and *Nagashima Akihisa* have concluded: *"The question is, will the Clinton and Obuchi governments continue to put energy into enhancing the alliance, or will they leave things on autopilot because the economic crisis appears too difficult and the mutual sense of frustration has become overwhelming?"*[81]

7.2 Okinawa as a Special Problem

The stationing of U.S. troops in Okinawa remains difficult to solve politically. Japanese prejudices and lack of understanding have contributed to a widespread "*siege mentality*" on account of the economic and social impacts of the military bases in Okinawa. After the return of Okinawa to Japan, it continued to bear the burden of the military bases in Japan. Okinawa, in terms of population, is still concentrated 300 times more heavily than the rest of Japan. In spite of a government investment of more than 5 trillion yen in Okinawa's economic revival over the last 25 years after, it has remained the poorest prefecture in Japan in terms of average annual income and, in the 1990s, had the highest unemployment rate at about 6 per cent (twice the national average). In the view of Okinawans, Tokyo did not live up to the promise of Vice-Admiral *Minoru Ota* (at the end of World War II) to in future give "*special consideration*" to the Okinawans.[82] More than 250,000 people on the island, nearly one fifth of the present population of Okinawa, died in the battle of Okinawa at the end of World War II. The prefec-

78 Quoted following Carpenter (1998: 4).
79 Funabashi (1998: 34).
80 See Doi (1999).
81 Green/Akihisa (1999: 19).
82 See Shimada (1997).

ture provides more than 75 per cent of the Japanese land used for U.S. bases, and more than half of the U.S. troops in Japan are based on the island. This has led to an increase in crime and traffic accidents. Though their local anger has been aroused against foreign military presence, it is even more directed towards the Japanese and Tokyo than to the U.S. soldiers on the island. Although the U.S. bases also provide significant economic benefits (Okinawa earns over 180 billion yen annually in revenue and more than 23,000 local residents have their jobs on U.S. bases), Okinawa's governor, *Masahide Ota*, hopes to close all U.S. bases in the islands by 2015.[83]

In dealing with the reduction of the bases and facilities, a *Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO*) was established between both sides at the end of 1995. Furthermore, an *Okinawa Problem Committee* was created as a channel to consider the issues from the viewpoint of the Okinawan residents. Although some progress has been made since the rape incident in September 1995, many issues are still unresolved. The proposed return of the *Futenma Marine Corps Air Station* (an airstrip in the middle of a congested Okinawan City) in 5-7 years like other questions involve many practical problems. Theoretically, the *U.S. Marines* and other facilities can move from Okinawa to the main islands of Japan. But from a military strategic point of view they must be deployed on the Japanese territory for rapid emergency deployment in crisis and conflicts such as on the Korean peninsula. Only the *U.S. Marine Corps*, for instance, offers the operational capabilities and requirements for rapid amphibious deployment, self-sustaining missions and the introduction of follow-on forces by securing staging areas ashore.[84] But other Japanese prefectures are still opposed to the transfers of U.S. facilities and soldiers to their areas. They live selfishly at the expense of the Okinawans who must continue to bear an unjustified military burden in the name of Japan as a whole. In contrast to many comments, the outcome of the gubernatorial elections in Okinawa in November 1998[85], when the incumbent governor *Matahide Ota* lost to a pragmatic conservative, the former chairman of a local petroleum company, *Keiichi Inamine*, 65, has not completely changed the picture and circumstances for the future of the military bases in Okinawa. Although the majority of voters seemed more concerned with the prefecture's difficult economic situation (which meanwhile has the Japan's highest unemployment rate with 9.2 per cent and which has been particularly affected by Japan's economic malaise in recent years, and the present financial and economic crisis in East Asia, and with Mr. *Inamine* being more pragmatic by suggesting more co-operative approaches such as the building of a new heliport in the less congested northern part of Okinawa), the basic problem of transferring some military bases to Japan's mainland in order to reduce the military burden for the Okinawian people has as yet not been solved. Moreover, Tokyo's bureaucracy seeks still to choose the easiest way forward by dismissing the objections and feelings of the Okinawan people as it has done throughout

83 See Sakurada (1998: 26).
84 See also Yamaguchi (1997).
85 See Kevin Sullivan, IHT (17 November 1998: 6).

the last 50 years. The need for reducing the military burden of Okinawa, however, will not disappear, as is also the case for the need to maintain U.S. troops in Okinawa and other Japanese territories. In the end, the outcome of the gubernatorial elections has only "*bought some breathing space. The fact remains that Okinawans generally are unhappy with the military bases*."[86] Even Mr. *Inamine* has limited the U.S. military presence on the islands to 15 years. This reflects local sentiment, confirmed by opinion polls, which remains strongly against the bases.[87]

7.3 The Domestic Front

Similar like Japan's quest for a permanent seat on the *UN Security Council*, a greater security role for Japan in the region, as well as in the bilateral security alliance with the U.S., is not without its fair share of problems and controversies. In the new post Cold War era, the former "*cheque book diplomacy*" is no longer sufficient for Japan's role in the newly defined bilateral security relationship with the U.S. As long as Japan remains unwilling to assume more military obligations in peace time, crises and war-time, a permanent seat in the *UN Security Council* will remain unrealistic, unless Japan (like Germany) commits itself to engage fully in UN peacekeeping and peacemaking operations.[88] As the U.S. withdrawal from Somalia and the reluctance to become militarily involved in Bosnia and Rwanda indicated, Washington is an increasingly casualty-sensitive country. Washington seems less and less willing to have Americans die in foreign countries, unless there is a clear and vital national interest at stake. Despite the positive steps that have been made in strengthening the bilateral alliance in recent years, the Japanese government needs to bolster its achievements with a more open dialogue to inform its own public. Broad public understanding of the necessity to assume new obligations within the alliance is an essential prerequisite for broad public support and regional acceptance in neighboring states. In this regard, more transparency is urgently necessary. The success of Japan's acceptance of new international roles and of future regional security depends on the justification of the new roles and obligations both in detail and in principle, since the former alliance presumptions are no longer valid. Hence the Japanese government must see itself as having a fundamental interest to initiate a serious national foreign and security debate. Thus far, however, the government seems to handle sensitive foreign and security issues like it always has and to avoid such a nation-wide debate with its public and local authorities. In the light of a continuing *"internal democratization of foreign policy"* in Japan, such attitudes of government and bureaucratic elites are outdated have become a major obstacle to assuming new international roles. Moreover, the lack of such an open debate also un-

86 Ching (1998).
87 See ibid.
88 See in this context also Drifte (1998).

dermines the political and military efficiency of a joint political crisis management and the bilateral defense co-operation when it is most needed. U.S. expert *Paul S. Giarra* warned at the beginning of 1997:

> "To redress the shortfalls, legislation, policies and cooperation between ministries must be arranged and settled in advance as part of the defense guidelines review process, not as a desperate last-minute effort in the face of a crisis. Needs must be explained to the municipal and prefectural governments involved and their explicit cooperation secured in advance. To delay would be militarily ineffective and politically disastrous. Otherwise Japan will be passed by militarily and, ultimately, cast adrift politically."[89]

The need for such a domestic debate has recently been highlighted by the incursion of two suspected North Korean military vessels and Japanese "*aggressive response*" by firing ammunition and sending destroyers in pursuit. However, Japan's coast guard vessels were too slow and vessels of the *Japanese Maritime Self Defense Forces* (*JMSDF*) tried unsuccessfully to pursue the North Korean ships.[90] As a result, the North Korean intruders were able to flee toward the North Korean coast. But the result was the "*first purely military operation ever assigned to the Self Defense Forces.*"[91] The *JMSDF* passive operation and the unsuccessful pursuit of the two fleeing ships can be explained by the fact that they are bound by extremely restrictive rules concerning the use of weapons in such situations. Thus the pursuit operation had to be legitimized *"on Paragraph 11, Article 6 of the Defense Agency Establishment Law, which stipulates that the SDF may carry out "research" necessary to execute its duties*" and by applying "*such seemingly irrelevant legislation as the Fisheries Law in dealing with the fleeing ships*." [92] This inadequacy in the *SDF's* rules has triggered a discussion about how the country should cope with an apparent challenge to its territory, how active Japan should become in its own defense and to what extent Japan is really prepared to cope with new security challenges.[93] It thus revealed the shortcomings, not only of the current legislation, but even of the Guidelines themselves because they address defense co-operation only under normal circumstances, in the event of an armed attack against Japan, and in situations in areas surrounding Japan as already indicated above. The incident thus revealed a significant lack of Japan's defense ability in routine peacetime defense operations and in cases which so far have been not identified. Thus, as in the case of *Japan's Maritime Safety Agency* coast guard ships, *JMSDF* naval vessels are only permitted to fire warning shots that "*will not cause human injury*" and even then only where a potential aggressor fired first.[94] Similarly, according to *Ralph Cossa*, some Japanese defense experts have even argued that Japanese ships armed with

---

89 Giarra (1997: 27).
90 See Mary Jordan, IHT (26 March 1999: 12).
91 Quoted following Cossa (1999).
92 See The Daily Yomiuri (3 May 1999: B 11-13, here B 11).
93 See ibid., in which the newspaper has published a set of proposals for amendments to laws and swift improvement in the operations of the *SDF, JMSDF* and the police in order to cope with those critical situations promptly and flexible under the direction of the prime minister.
94 See ibid.

defensive missiles operating outside Japan's territorial waters would not be permitted to fire at incoming missiles until the first missile struck Japan. Hence, though the implementation of the Defense Guidelines allows for a greater, smoother and more effective military co-operation between Japan and the U.S., it "*still falls short of permitting Japanese Self Defense Forces from effectively responding to such situations*"[95] or other newly arising security challenges. In many ways, the incident was more significant "*what didn't happen*" as *the Far Eastern Economic Review* has argued:

> "The rounds fired by the coastguard and navy were merely warning shots, and didn't stop the intruders from speeding back to a North Korean port. Nor did Tokyo make any determined effort to capture the ships - a step that could have provoked a battle, with casualties on both sides. In fact, the Japanese gave up the chase when the ships were in international waters."[96]

Furthermore, and contrary to the public perception, the agreed *Guidelines of Bilateral Defense Co-operation* will not automatically be invoked nor are they currently ready to be implemented. On the contrary, it is the political decision of the leadership in Tokyo and Washington that will finally activate the line of joint operation at a time of a crisis. Even beforehand, the Japanese government will have to enact new laws or to revise existing legislative acts - such as the *Law of the Self Defense Forces* - to formally implement the above activities. Moreover, the *Guidelines* review was from the very beginning conducted with the basic premise that the rights and obligations under the current U.S.-Japanese Security arrangements will remain unchanged and that Japanese actions will also remain restricted within the limitations of its constitution and other basic stated principles. This raises many questions concerning the ability of future Japanese governments to live up to the agreed obligations. In this respect, some doubts remain due to specific traits of the Japanese political culture, an increasingly outdated political system and its impact on political crisis management, as well as in regard to its bilateral relationship to China. Characteristically, the government's most successful argumentation in parliamentary debates about the implementation of the *Defense Guidelines* has been *gaiatsu* (foreign pressure) - an implicit threat that Washington will be upset if the bills aren't implemented.[97]

If China becomes an increasing threat or even enemy of Japan or the bilateral alliance with Washington, Japan would have no choice but to side with the U.S. However, there is a widespread believe in Japan that in case of a U.S.-China conflict, Japan should stay neutral and not become involved in such a conflict. *Yabuki Susumu,* for instance, demanded in November 1995:

> "If U.S.-China relations move in the direction of confrontation, Japan, of course, can do nothing about it. No matter how strong Washington's demands, Tokyo cannot cooperate in imposing even economic sanc-

95 Cossa (1999).
96 Landers (1999).
97 See ibid.

tions, much less military ones. The most crucial thing is for Japan to be clearly aware that its only choice is to avoid movement in that direction."[98]

This, however, runs contrary to the agreed security alliance with the U.S. and the expectations and perceptions of U.S. politicians, especially in the *U.S. Congress*. If Japan refuses to side unequivocally with the U.S. in a foreign policy crisis, the security alliance might be dead the next day. Even a slow Japanese response - as was the case during the Taiwan crisis, when the government needed more than three weeks to respond to a request from Washington for the delivery of spare parts, oil and ammunition - might upset the alliance, given the expected attitude of the U.S. Congress in such a scenario. However, given the political culture in Japan and her understanding of crisis management and political leadership (which means building at first consensus in the government party, the bureaucracy, together with a possible coalition party, and then in the Diet), it seems somehow questionable whether Japan will be able to live up to its treaty obligations. The crisis management of the former Japanese governments in the *Kobe* earthquake at the beginning of 1995, during the *AUM Shinrykio* gas attack shortly afterwards and the following events of chaos in the government, as well as in the police in coping with the new terrorist threat and during the Taiwan crisis from summer 1995 to the spring of 1996 and the more recent incident by North Korean ships intruding Japanese waters, as well as the initial reaction of the bureaucracy when North Korea tested a three-stage *Taepo-dong* missile over Japan[99], were all characterized by delay, indecision and a fundamental lack of political leadership. That kind of crisis management does not bode well for any other major crisis the bilateral security alliance may face in the future. Even a member of Japan's *House of Representatives* and former parliamentary vice-minister of foreign affairs, *Shozo Azuma*, was forced to admit: "*Japan is not prepared to deal with a crisis of any nature, domestic or foreign; the nation is an accident waiting to happen*."[100]

Presently, Japan's inability to respond swiftly and confidently to the current financial and economic crises in a rapidly changing world seems to demonstrate once again that its political system is haunted by political infighting, a leaden bureaucracy and a reliance on foreign pressure ("*gaiatsu*") to force any major political decisions.[101] As long as Japan is not deeply reforming her entire economic and political system, it seems neither able to return to a higher economic growth nor to show any political leadership in Asia.[102] In this light, it is not so much the incompetence of *Hashimoto* or any other prominent political figure or government in Japan, but the political system in Japan as such which seems largely outdated and unable to undertake the rapid and flexible political decision-making urgently needed for the 21st century. As an insider admitted: "*In our collective group decision-making no one has the power*

98 Susumu (1996: 38).
99 To details of the crisis management of the Japanese government and Self Defence Agency in regard to the North Korean missile launch see Umbach (1999b: 36).
100 Shozo Azuma, IHT, 20 December (1996: 8).
101 See also Kevin Sullivan/Mary Jordan, IHT (10 April 1998: 17).
102 See in context also Stockwin (1998) and Calder (1998).

to say right or wrong, black or white."[103] In the face of its current economic turmoil, it is not so much Japan's unwillingness than the inability of her political system that explains Japan's economic and political paralysis.[104] As long as Japan has no modern political system which is open to public and particularly the middle class influence rather than to bureaucrats and narrow interest groups, the crisis in Japan and in Asia may well last much longer than most Japanese and foreign observers assume. But there is some light at the end of the tunnel: the last Japanese elections in July 1998 clearly demonstrated that Japanese voters apparently understand the country's problems better than the current leadership. These elections have also shown that the ruling LDP is increasingly out of touch with the majority of Japanese society (supported only by older voters as public opinion surveys have indicated).[105] In this regard, I follow the argumentation of the U.S. expert *Robert M. Orr, Jr.*: " *... the Japan of the next century needs to depend less upon outsiders for positive change in this society, but more on the people and less on the bureaucrats*."[106] At the same time, Japan's political system and her society is confronted with the wide-ranging implications of "*internationalization*" and "*globalization*". To remain a major industrial nation in the future, based primarily on intellectual resources, Japan will be forced to improve its labor productivity by promoting free competition and to foster creativity by encouraging free thinking.[107] For many Japanese, this presents a similar revolutionary challenge to those in the *Meiji* era. However, many once-time taboos in Japan's domestic discussion of its foreign, security and even defense policies, such as building limited first-strike capabilities (i.e. airborne refueling equipment, assault ships with helicopters and *Harrier*-type aircraft to land in mid-sea), Japanese participation in peacekeeping operations, loosening restrictions on Japan's military support for the U.S. in the region, purchase of four reconnaissance satellites and funding research and development to build a TMD system are now rapidly fading.[108]

This inability of Japanese crisis management also has fundamental implications for the future of the bilateral security alliance. *Hashimoto"s* pledge of a greater defense role in the region in April 1996, when the bilateral security relationship was redefined, has pushed the boundaries of current interpretations of the restrictions imposed on Japan's military by *Article*

---

103 Kevin Sullivan/Mary Jordan, IHT (10 April 1998: 17). Another typical feature of the Japan's culture is that they tend not to speak out face-to-face problems during day-time. So to listen what they really think, it is important to meet them later and have really frank discussions over dinner.

104 Characteristically, the performance of a recent Japanese-*IMF* meeting in mid-April 1998 has been described by Western observers as follows: "*The Japanese presentation was incomprehensible, for all of us. ... The [finance] minister* [of Japan, Hikaru Matsunaga] *gave a two-hour speech that we could not understand. When we started to ask him questions, he started to repeat the speech. I have no idea how Japan sees the problem, or what can be done*" and "*It is not that the Japanese described an approach with which we disagreed. They described nothing at all. It was as if they were on another planet, dealing with a totally different situations that we know nothing about*" - see Jim Hoagland, IHT (23 April 1998: 9).

105 See Johnstone (1998).

106 Robert J. Orr, Jr., TKH (26 December 1997: 6).

107 See Taichi Sakaiya, TKH (21 January 1998: 6).

108 See also Stephanie Strom, IHT (9 April 1999: 2).

9 in the so-called "*Peace Constitution*", although the government declared in the *Diet* that no new interpretation or revision would be necessary. The key to continued American presence and influence in the region will depend on the continued integrity of the U.S.-Japanese alliance. And the latter will depend heavily on the continuity and consistency of Japan's defined national interests and the assessment of its own mid- and long-term policy considerations. The so-called "*Partnership in Leadership*" declaration might satisfy the majority of Japanese politicians and the public concerning Japan's ambitions to assume a greater political role in the "*unequal alliance*". But the question remains whether Japan is really prepared to assume such a role in the new security environment. Thus far, Japan has only a record of being leader "*as long as there is no real combat activity requiring the sheriff himself to handle things properly*" as the German Japan expert *Markus Tidten* stated at the end of 1997.[109] And indeed, it is also necessary to raise the even more painful question for Japan of "*who will be willing to accept Japan's leadership in the region"*?[110] In many respects, the redefinition of the security alliance and the *Guidelines for Defense Co-operation* was not so much an American request list than sincere considerations on both sides of what Japan can be asked to fulfil as her part of the alliance's obligations without endangering the future of the partnership.[111]

While most Japanese experts still interpret the constitutional provisions of the "*use of force*" in a way that prohibits the participation of *SDF* in combat actions that also include the transportation of materials (particularly ammunition) and its own weapon systems into combat zones, meanwhile it might be able to transport at least U.S. weapons and ammunitions in rear-areas in non-combat zones.[112] Furthermore, the new *Liberal Party* head and "*strong man*", *Ozawa Ichiro*[113], recently went even further and interpreted the controversial sentence "*situations in areas surrounding Japan*" not as a "*situational concept*" but indeed as a geographical one because those "*situations*" might inevitably have significant impact on Japan's peace and security, the Japanese government has been forced to re-define this in such a way that the disputed interpretations of the controversial sentence of the scope of "*Far East*" now "*1) correspond to cases which will have significant impact on Japan's peace and security, 2) include geographical elements, but 3) do not imply any specific areas.*"[114] Moreover, it remains difficult to understand, even for U.S. experts familiar which Japan's domestic debates, that the new Defense Guidelines have expanded Japan's security and defense roles in Asia. The *1960 Mutual Defense Treaty* already refers in regard to Japan's co-operation to promote regional stability to the "*Far East*". Furthermore, former Japanese governments have since the 1980s

109 Markus Tidten, TKH (6 December 1997: 6).
110 Ibid.
111 Ibid.
112 See Soeya (1999).
113 *Ichiro Ozawa* became well-known for his 1993 book "*Blueprint for a New Japan*"' in which he criticized Japan's "*politics as usual*" approach as a major obstacle for devising a realistic national security strategy based on a strong security alliance with the U.S.
114 See Soeya (1999)

accepted a sea lane defense up to 1,000 nautical miles from Japan.[115] It is not difficult to foresee and to assume that this re-definition will not be the last, given Japan's more intensive debate in recent years and newly emerging situations which have as yet not been addressed by the Defense Guidelines. On the other hand, a clarification of the area might unnecessarily provoke China, "*while excluding Taiwan would be tantamount to giving China a green light to use force against Taiwan without having to be concerned about Japanese security concerns.*"[116] Nonetheless, a gap remains between U.S. expectations (particularly in the *U.S. Congress*) and the consensus in Japan's domestic audience. In many ways, Japan still seems insufficiently prepared for a real *"Partnership in Leadership"*. Australian expert *Andrew Mack* warned in June 1997:

> "If a crisis erupted tomorrow, Japan's reaction could be determined less by the constitution or the new guidelines than by bitter political fights over their proper interpretation. Such squabbles could well last longer than the war. ...
>
> Yet something needs to be done. The fact that, after decades together as allies, the United States and Japan still have no clearly defined and agreed rules of military cooperation in a crisis is not just bizarre. It could be seriously destabilizing in a real-life conflict."[117]

If this conclusion is correct, then the U.S. has to bear in mind that Japan might also in future not be fully prepared and the U.S. should not demand too much from Japan if a new crisis arises.[118] Accordingly, U.S. experts like *Robert M. Orr, Jr.* have warned:

> "Do we really believe that the Japanese side would follow every letter of the new defense guidelines in an emergency? The fact that the military forces of both countries have a record of exceedingly good cooperation does not negate the reality that lack of a 'buy-in' by the localities with the Japanese central government in a crisis situation could throw a monkey wrench into the whole situation. If so, it would reflect the fate of many U.S.-Japan trade agreements in which differing interpretations amount to the norm as opposed to the exception."[119]

At the same time, public opinion polls often reveal contradicting or ambiguous trends. According to an opinion poll in August 1996, for instance, 76 per cent of Japanese favor revising the American-written "*Peace Constitution*" in favor of a new Japanese written constitution. But it remains unclear whether this can be seen as another indication of becoming *"a normal nation"* or as a new spirit of nationalism which is feared by much of Asia, as well as by parts of Japanese society.[120]

---

115 See Cossa (1999).
116 So Green/Akihisa (1999: 20).
117 Andrew Mack, IHT (20 June 1997: 8).
118 A new book by the former Prime Minister *Tomiichi Murayama*, called "*So Ja No*" ("*Hmm, let me see*"), is a vividly illustration of how little leadership can be expected from the head of Japan and how different the Japanese understanding and concept of leadership is from that of many other countries - see Landers (1998).
119 Robert M. Orr, Jr., TKH, (25 December 1997: 6).
120 See Edward Neilan, TKH (9 August 1997: 6) and Robert J. Fouser, ibid. (7 January 1997: 6).

8. Conclusions and Perspectives

At first glance, the strategic security outlook in North and East Asia seems never to have been so positive on account of the almost simultaneous improvement in bilateral relations between each of the four major powers in the region - Japan, China, Russia and the United States - during the last three years. The two *Jiang-Clinton* summits in late October 1997 and May 1998 marked the beginning of a new strategic partnership between the U.S. and China after the bloody *Tiananmen* events in 1989 and the Taiwan crisis in 1995-96. These two summits have enhanced trust, reduced differences and developed co-operation that promises to avoid open confrontation, as in the Taiwan crisis in 1995-96. It forced the two leading great powers in the Asia-Pacific region to develop a workable strategic framework for the management of their relationship into the 21st century. On the other hand, however, these summits have also caused some ambivalent feelings in Japan concerning the bilateral security alliance with the U.S. While Japan also welcomes better U.S.-Chinese relations, they do not welcome them at the expense of good Japan-U.S relations.[121] These sensitivities on the Japanese side must also take into account the fact that Japan's traditional postwar role as a "*bridge*" between the two cultures of Asia and the West is no longer necessary given the numerous new direct institutional links between these two regions (*APEC, ASEM, ARF, CSCAP* etc.). In this newly evolving geopolitical order, Japan increasingly fears being passed over. It has thus become fashionable to say that the U.S. attitude towards Japan has changed from "*Japan bashing*" to "*Japan passing*".[122] In this regard, Washington needs to rebuild trust and confidence in its bilateral relationship with Tokyo, which must last longer than any sudden economic or other clashes of competing interests that realistically can not totally be avoided between the two countries.

The new tendency to institutionalize multilateral security dialogues rather than conflict resolution mechanisms suggests that the analytical tool of multilateralism versus bilateralism is too simplistic and consequently gives rise to a false debate for the multifaceted regional security environment in Asia-Pacific. As the new multilateralism, as well as the violent crisis and the forced unilateral response by the United States particularly in 1995-96, have demonstrated, both elements are necessary in establishing a viable, double-layered security architecture in the Asia Pacific region that is able and flexible enough to cope with the new challenges and uncertainties of the transformation processes into the next century. The security architecture in the Asia-Pacific region thus comprises strong bilateral relationships interwoven with multilateral security arrangements such as the *ARF*. Both components are not mutually exclusive but mutually reinforcing and supportive.[123] To this extent, the U.S.-Japan alliance and the other four solid bilateral defense relations of the U.S. with the Philippines, Thailand, Australia and South Korea remain the bedrock of security and stability in the region as the official

121 See Tom Plate, IHT (2-3 May 1998: 6).
122 See Haruyuki Aikawa, Mainichi Daily News (22 August 1996).
123 See also Cossa (1997: 37) and Umbach (1998a: 277f.).

U.S. *East Asia Strategy Report 1998* has confirmed*: "The United States will remain globally engaged to* ***shape*** *the international environment;* ***respond*** *to the full spectrum of crises; and* ***prepare*** *now for an uncertain future*."[124] These bilateral defense alliances provide a reliable insurance mechanism if preventive diplomacy should fail, as is the case in Europe with *NATO* and its interlocking institutions of *OSCE* and the *EU/WEU*.

Japan's "*two track-policy*" since 1992, but also similar policies of many *ASEAN* states confirm these conclusions. The U.S. presence is still perceived to be indispensable by most East Asian states, as a counterbalance to any attempts by regional powers such as China, Japan or India to expand their influence at the expense of smaller countries and to adopt a destabilizing assertive role in the region. In this light, the strengthening of the U.S.-Japan military alliance has demonstrated U.S. determination to retain an active role in the Pacific. Against this background, the redefined bilateral security treaty serves three major purposes for maintaining security and stability in the Asia-Pacific region:

- (1) it provides a "*nuclear umbrella*" that has protected Japan and allowed it to avoid politically complicated issues;
- (2) it guarantees a continuous U.S. military presence in the region, which allows Japan and other Asian countries to cope with transition in an atmosphere of stability;
- (3) it helps the U.S. to protect its interests in the region, while reducing its military-related costs through Japan's host nation support.[125]

With the consolidation of the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance, Japan's increasing independent role as a major security actor is now - as the new and old partner of the U.S. - less worrisome for the rest of East Asia (though with the notable exceptions of China and North Korea). At the same time, however, new Japanese calls (in the light of the current economic and financial crisis) for a reduction of U.S. military bases and the Japanese host nation support to "*carry the largest burden among the U.S. allies"* are continuing, as was demonstrated by the former Japanese Prime Minister, *Morihiro Hosokawa*, in the summer of 1998.[126] Given mutual expectations on both sides of the bilateral relationship in the current financial and economic crisis, both parties have a responsibility to avoid a crisis of mutual confidence in order not to undermine the overall regional security architecture.[127] In this regard, from a liberal theory of international relations, it is necessary to base the future bilateral security alliance between Japan and the U.S. more on an equal partnership and common values, shared effort as well as shared decision-making that ultimately serve the goals of democracy, human rights, economic

124 The Secretary of Defense (1998: 8). In the context see also Wagner (1999).
125 See Soeya (1995).
126 Hosokawa (1998: 5). To a response see Auer (1998).
127 See also Melby (1998).

development and regional inclusiveness.[128] As the recent election of *Shinaro Ishihara*, a well-known nationalist (who dismissed the 1937 *Rape of Nanking* as "*fabrication*" and that Japanese aggression rescued Asia from "*colonization by white people*") and author of the 1980 book "*The Japan That Can Say No*" (urging a more assertive policy toward the U.S. and China), to the new governor of Tokyo demonstrated, however, the attacks of pacifists and nationalists on the U.S.-Japanese security alliance and other sensitive and critical key questions of a balanced Japanese foreign and security policy are far from over. Thus *Ishihara* publicly demanded that the U.S. to give up the *Yokota Air base* in Tokyo.[129]

Despite the legislative approval of the *Defense Guidelines* by a *Lower House* special committee at the end of April 1999, the closed door meetings between the *LDP*, *Liberal Party*, *New Komeito* and *the Democratic Party of Japan* (spending most of their time to reach compromises over terms and phrases of the bill) and the debate focusing rather on military-technical aspects (since the government was so anxious to obtain the *Lower House's* approval) has hindered the need to initiate a more open debate among the Japanese public about the overall vision of Japan's security policy and the significance of the *Guidelines* for the bilateral security alliance with Washington. Nonetheless, the legislation is a great step forward in enabling Japan to play a significantly larger role in the security of its own territory and allows Japan for the first time to co-operate with U.S. forces also in "*areas surrounding*" Japan. Furthermore, although the clause concerning ship inspections was removed, *SDF* logistic support operations in non-combat zones as well as search-and-rescue operations continue to need a Diet approval. But in the event of high-level emergencies, the approval can also come after an *SDF* dispatch. During such logistic support and search-and-rescue operations in non-combat zones, the use of weapons is allowed but at the same time restricted to self-defense.[130] Furthermore, as the result of *Ichiro Ozawa's* ability to force political changes, Japanese units will in future share the same risks of peacekeeping as all other countries. Japanese commanders will thus now even be able to direct the defense of their units in the event that they are attacked.[131]

Moreover, Japan's participation in the TMD project together with the U.S. will strengthen Japan's defenses and deterrence posture and deflect pressure at home for it to have a nuclear deterrent capability. This, however, might not be totally excluded in the future. Even in the case where the U.S. and its major allies in Northeast Asia were to stop their plans for TMD development and deployment, Beijing's strategic nuclear force modernization would nonetheless continue for other military-strategic reasons and probable internal bureaucratic factors, as Chinese experts privately admit.[132]

---

128 See Mochizuki (1998).
129 See IHT (13 April 1999: 10), Nicholas D. Kristof (27-28 March 1999: 1) and IHT (24-25 April 1999: 7).
130 See the article 'Defense Changes Dodged Public Debate', in: Japan Times (26 April 1999).
131 See Giarra (1999).
132 See Umbach (1999b: 38 and 2000a).

But both the U.S. and Japan need to demonstrate that the aim of their alliance is the preservation of security rather than the containment of China. At the same time, Japan should play a constructive and visible role in the multilateral security institutions for easing tensions on the Korean peninsula or in other potential flashpoints. Therefore, the U.S.-Japanese security alliance must be harmonized with the U.S.-South Korean alliance. In the short- and long-term, the U.S. can neither address the proliferation challenges on the Korean peninsula or other security challenges in the region nor can it credibly engage China or maintain open and *SLOCs* without Japanese assistance. Such a harmonization between these two security alliances has also important foreign, security and defense implications for Japan and South Korea.[133] It would also allow a greater bi- and trilateral security and defense co-operation towards the North Korean security challenges on the peninsula and significantly open a way for a much closer relationship between Japan and South Korea.

Given its traditional strategic security culture of "*reluctant realism*" as a guiding determining factor and philosophy of Japan's international relations after World War Two, Japan will to some extent still remain a "*reluctant power*" in the foreseeable future although the strategic security culture of realism is gradually and incrementally increasing as recent shifts in the evolution of Japan's security and defense policies, particularly after the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in May 1998, as well as North Korea's three-stage *Taepo-Dong* missile launch at the end of August 1998 demonstrate. Institutional enhancements such as the establishment of the *Japan Defense Intelligence Head-quarters* in 1997 and a strategic planning unit in 1998, as well as an increasing active defense diplomacy (including military exchanges, training, multilateral forums) are also indicators of a more active national and independent defense policy although these changes and enhancements also contribute to the strengthening of the U.S.-Japanese security alliance. To this extent, the Japanese role within the alliance is clearly growing, and Japan is at the same time becoming a more equal partner for the U.S., which will bolster the U.S.-Japanese security alliance into the 21st century.

133 See also Hisahiko Okazaki, The Daily Yomiuri (29 March 1999).

The Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation

(September 1997)

I. Aim:

to create a solid basis for Japan/U.S. **cooperation in case of an armed attack against Japan and in situations in areas surrounding Japan**

III: Cooperation Under Normal Circumstances:

- maintaining existing U.S./Japan security arrangements;
- as a basis for self defense Japan's "National Defense Program Outline";
- U.S. will maintain its nuclear deterrent capability, forward deployed forces in Asia-Pacific region and other forces;
- close U.S./Japan cooperation for the defense of Japan and the creation of a more stable international security environment (i.e. mutual support activities or Reciprocal Provision of Logistic Support):
- both governments will increase information and intelligence sharing at as many levels as possible (i.e. SCC and Security Sub Committee meetings);
- recognizing the importance of security dialogues defense exchanges in the region and international arms control and disarmament;
- close cooperation in the case of participation in UN-peacekeeping operations (i.e. transportation, medical services or information sharing);
- both governments will conduct bilateral work, including defense planning in case of an armed attack against Japan;
- bilateral exercises and training, establishing a bilateral coordination mechanism.

IV: Actions in Response to An Armed Attack Against Japan

- in case of an armed attack appropriate bilateral measures to repel it at the earliest possible stage;
- preparations necessary for ensuring coordinated responses;
- U.S./Japan will prepare to respond to activities which could develop into an armed attack against Japan.

When an armed attack against Japan takes place:

- bilateral cooperation may vary according scale, type, phases and other factors of an armed attack;
- the self defense forces will primarily conduct self defense operations on Japanese territory and surrounding waters, while U.S. forces would support Self-Defense Forces operations;
- both will bilaterally conduct operations for the defense of surrounding waters and for the protection of sea lines of communication;
- primary responsibility of the Self Defense Force is to check and repel guerilla-attacks or other unconventional attacks at the earliest possible stage;
- U.S./Japan coordination to respond to ballistic missile attack;
- bilateral coordination center for effective bilateral operations .

V. Cooperation in Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan's peace and security (Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan)

- such situations will have an important influence on Japan's peace and security;
- the concept "situations in areas surrounding Japan" *is not geographic but situational*;
- when such a situation is anticipated, both governments will intensify information and intelligence sharing;
- in response to such situations both governments will take appropriate measures such as
  - relief activities and measures to deal with refugees;
  - search and rescue;
  - noncombatant evacuation operations (from a third country);
  - activities for ensuring the effectiveness of economic sanctions for the maintenance of international peace and stability; rear area support by Japan to U.S. forces (primarily in Japanese territory).

VI. Bilateral Programs for Effective Defense Cooperation Under the Guidelines

- information and intelligence sharing and policy consultations;
- establishing two mechanisms:
  - comprehensive mechanism for bilateral planning, establishment of common standards;
  - bilateral coordination mechanism that will include relevant agencies of the two countries for coordinating respective activities during contingencies.

- U.S. forces and Self Defense Forces will conduct bilateral defense planning;
- mutual cooperation planning must be consistent;
- establishing common standards for preparations for the defense of Japan;
- common procedures will also include criteria for properly controlling respective unit operations, importance of communications and electronics interoperability.

Source: Frank Umbach, following 'The Guidelines for US-Japan Defense Co-operation', in: *Strategic Digest*, November 1997, pp. 1723-1730.

References

Auer, James E. (1998). "A Win-Win Alliance for Asia." In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 33, 14 August.

Baginada, Abdul Razak Abdullah (1994). *Japan's Security Policy in the Post-Cold War Era. Towards the Enhancement of its Security Ties*. Kuala Lumpur.

Ball, Desmond (1993). "Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region." In: *Security Studies*, No.1 Autumn: 44-74.

Baum, Julian (1998). "A Friend Indeed." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 26 November: 26-27.

Baum, Julian et al. (1998). "The Crying Game." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 16 July: 16-17.

Bijang, Yang (1996). "Why US-Japan Joint Declaration on Security Alliance?" In: *Contemporary International Relations*, May: 1-12.

Breer, William T. (1998). "A Chance to Restore the Balance." In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 36, 18 September.

Calder, Kent (1998). "Asia's Deepening Financial Crisis: Japan as a Critical Uncertainty." In: *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2: 75-86.

Calder, Kent E. (1997). *Asia's Deadly Triangle. How Arms, Energy and Growth Threaten to Destabilize Asia-Pacific*. London/Sonoma.

Carpenter, Galen Ted (1998). "Roiling Asia." In: *Foreign Affairs*, November-December: 2-6.

Ching, Frank (1996). "Diaoyu Dispute: Complex Issues." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 3 October: 32.

Ching, Frank (1997). "Government vs. Citizens." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 11 September: 32.

Ching, Frank (1998). "Buying Time in Okinawa." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 10 December: 44.

Cossa, Ralph A. (1997). "U.S.-Japan Security Relations: Separating Fact from Fiction." In: Ralph A. Cossa, ed. *Restructuring the U.S.-Japan Alliance. Toward a More Equal Partnership*, The CSIS Press, Washington D.C.: 31-49.

Cossa, Ralph A. (1999). "Beyond the Defense Guidelines: Responding to Intruders." In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 13, 2 April.

Cronin, Patrick M. (1996). "The U.S.-Japan Alliance Redefined." In: *Strategic Forum*, No. 75, May.

Dibb, Paul (1996). *The Emerging Geopolitics of the Asia-Pacific Region*. Working Paper No. 296, Strategic & Defense Studies Center, Canberra.

Doi, Ayako (1999). "The Obuchi-Clinton Summit: A Surprisingly Effective Performance." In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 18, 7 May.

Dosch, Jörn (1998). *The United States and the New Security Architecture of the Asia-Pacific - A European View*. The Asia-Pacific Research Center/Stanford University's Institute for International Studies, Stanford.

Drifte, Reinhard (1999). "The US-Japan-China Security Triangle and the Future of East Asian Security." In: Laurent Goetschel, ed. *Security in a Globalized World: Risks and opportunities.* Baden-Baden: 53-65.

Drifte, Reinhard (1998). "Japan's Quest for a Permanent Seat on the Security Council." In: *Asia-Pacific Review*, No. 2: 87-109.

"East Asian Views of the Japan-U.S. Defense Guidelines. Asia-Pacific Journalists Meeting 1997" (1998). In: *Japan Echo*, February: 59-62.

Feng, Ni (1997). "Staerkeres Sicherheitsbuendnis zwischen Japan und den USA besorgniserregend." In: *Beijing Rundschau*, No. 24: 8-11.

Feske, Susanne (1997). "The US-Japanese Security Alliance: Out of Date or Highly Fashionable?" In: *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Summer-Fall: 430-451.

Flamm, Don (1998). "Is US Overseas Presence Still Important for Asia?" In: *Asian Defence Journal (ADJ)*, No. 8: 6-11.

Forney, Matt (1996). "Patriot Games." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 3 October: 22-25.

Funabashi, Yoichi (1998). "Tokyo's Depression Diplomacy." In: *Foreign Affairs*, November-December: 26-36.

Garrett, Banning/Glaser, Bonnie (1997). "Chinese Apprehensions About Revitalization of the U.S.-Japan Alliance." In: *Asian Survey*, April: 382-402.

Giarra, Paul S. (1997). "Point of Choice, Point of Departure." In: *Japan Quarterly*, January-March: 16-29.

Giarra, Paul S. (1999). "Peacekeeping: As Good for the Alliance As It Is for Japan?" In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 6, 12 February.

Green, Michael J./Akihisa, Nagashima (1999). "Key Areas to Watch in Japan-U.S. Security Relations." In: *Japan Quarterly*, January-March: 17-22.

Green, Michael J./Self, Benjamin L. (1996). "Japan´s Changing China Policy: From Commercial Liberalism to Reluctant Realism." In: *Survival*, No 2: 35-58.

Harris, Stuart (1997). “The China-Japan Relationship and Asia-Pacific Regional Security.” In: *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, No. 1: 121-148.
Hashimoto, Mothide (1997). *Security in Southeast Asia and the Role of Japan*. Tokyo.
Hoshino, Toshiya (1997). *Triggers of Conflict in Southeast Asia: Cooperation and Conflict Avoidance - A Japanese Perspective*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Promoting Trust and Confidence in Southeast Asia: Cooperation and Conflict Avoidance, October 16-19.
Hosokawa, Morihiro (1998). “Are U.S. Troops in Japan Needed? Reforming the Alliance.” In: *Foreign Affairs*, July-August: 2-5.
Johnson, Chalmers (1995). “The Pentagon’s Ossified Strategy.” In: *Foreign Affairs*, July-August: 103-114.
Johnson, Chalmers (1996). “Go Home.” In: *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, July-August: 22-29.
Johnston, Alastair Iain (1995). “Thinking about Strategic Culture.” In: *International Security*, No. 4, Spring: 32-64.
Johnstone, Christopher B. (1998). “The July 12 Elections: A New Page in Japanese Democracy?” In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 29, 17 July.
Kaneko, Kumao (1996). “Japan Needs No Umbrella.” In: *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, March-April: 46-51.
Katzenstein, Peter J., ed. (1996). *The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York.
Katzenstein, Peter/Okawara, Nobuo (1993). *Japan’s National Security. Structures, Norms and Policy Responses in a Changing World*. Ithaca/New York.
Kawasaki, Tsuyoshi (1997). “Between Realism and Idealism in Japanese Security Policy: The Case of the ASEAN Regional Forum.” In: *The Pacific Review*, No. 4: 480-503.
Kreft, Heinrich Kreft (1995). “Japan-USA: Primat der Handelsbeziehungen.” In: *Aussenpolitik*, No. 2: 175-185.
Kristof, Nicholas D. (1998). “The Problem of Memory.” In: *Foreign Affairs*, No. 6, November/December: 37-49.
Landers, Peter (1998). “Too Shy for Big Time.” In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 30 July: 23.
Landers, Peter (1999). “Military Makeover?” In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 15 April: 24.
Lawrence, Susan V. (1998). “Miles to Go.” In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 26 November: 21-22, 24.
Lebow, Richard N./Risse-Knappen, Thomas, eds. (1993). *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War*. New York.
Masahiro, Akiyama (1998a). “Confidence Building.” In: *Look Japan*, August: 3.
Masahiro, Akiyama (1998b). “Japan’s Security Policy Toward the 21st Century.” In: *RUSI Journal*, April: 5-9.
Maull, Hanns W. (1991). “Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers.” In: *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 90/91: 91-106.
McDewitt, Michael (1998). “Engaging China: The Clinton Visit.” In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 25, 19 June.
Melby, Eric D.K. (1998). “Next Steps in the U.S.-Japan Relationship.” In: *PacNet Newsletter*, No. 34, 21 August.
Mochizuki, Mike M. (1995). “Japan as an Asia-Pacific Power.” In: Robert S. Ross, ed. *East Asia in Transition. Toward a Regional Order*. Singapore/New York: 124-159.
Mochizuki, Mike M. (1998). “A Liberal Vision for the US-Japanese Alliance.” In: *Survival*, Summer 1998: 127-134.
Mosher, Michael (1997). *What If U.S.-Japan Security Treaty Fails to Deter? Reflections on the Guidelines Review*. Unpublished paper, Tulsa, June.
Neilan, Edward (1998). “Japanese Find New Links with Partners in Taiwan.” In: *The Free China Journal*, 1 May: 7.
Neuffer, John F. (1998). *Behind the Screen: Roundup of Japanese Politics*. 11 October, Tokyo. (via Internet - http://www.bekkoame.or.jp/~jneuffer/files/backIssues/62.html).
Nishihara, Masahi (1994a). “Das veraenderte Sicherheitsumfeld in Asien - die Strategie Japans.” In: *Europa Archiv*, No. 4: 109-115.
Noda, Eijiro (1997). “Turning to Asia. Japan’s New Orientations.” In: *World Affairs*, No. 1: 138-148.
Nye, Joseph (1995). “The Case for Deep Engagement.” In: *Foreign Affairs*, July-August: 90-102.
Rittberger, Volker, ed. (1993). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford.
Robinson, James A. (1996). “Role of ’Strategic Ambiguity’” in US Policy.” In: *The Free China Journal*, 6 December: 7.
“Rocks of Contention” (1996). In: Far Eastern Economic Review, 19 September: 14-15.
Sakurada, Daizo (1998). “Why We Need the US-Japan Security Treaty.” In: *Asia-Pacific Review*, Spring-Summer: 13-38.

Shimada, Haruo (1997). "The Significance of the Okinawa Issue: The Experience of the Okinawa Problem Committee." In: Ralph A. Cossa, ed. *Restructuring the U.S.-Japan Alliance. Toward a More Equal Partnership?* The CSIS Press, Washington D.C.: 83-97.

Shinn, James (1997). "Testing the United States-Japan Security Alliance." In: *Current History*, December: 425-430.

Snyder, Glenn H. (1990). "Alliance Theory: A Neo-Realist First Cut." In: *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring-Summer: 103-125.

Snyder, Glenn H. (1991). "Alliances, Balance, and Stability." In: *International Organization*, No. 1: 21-142.

Soeya, Yoshihide (1995). "A Secure Alliance." In: *Look Japan*, September: 17.

Soeya, Yoshihide (1996). "On the border." In: *Look Japan*, November: 19.

Soeya, Yoshihide (1997). "Points of Departure." In: *Look Japan*, February: 17.

Soeya, Yoshihide (1999). "The Correct Use of Force." In: *Look Japan*, April: 23.

Spero, Joshua B./Umbach, Frank (1994). "NATO's Security Challenge to the East and the American-German Geo-Strategic Partnership in Europe." In: *Report of BIOst (Federal Institute for East European and International Studies)*, No. 39. Cologne.

Stockwin, J. A. A. (1998). "Deciphering Japanese Politics." In: *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2: 165-180.

Susumu, Yabuki (1996). "Reading Beijing's Foreign Policy." In: *Japan-Echo*, Spring: 35-38.

"The Guidelines for US-Japan Defense Cooperation" (1997). In: *Strategic Digest*, November: 1723-1730.

The Secretary of Defense, ed. (1998). *The United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region*. Washington D.C.

Umbach, Frank (1998a). "ASEAN und die regionale Kooperation im asiatisch-pazifischen Raum." In: W. Wagner et al., eds. *Jahrbuch Internationale Politik 1995/96*. München: 270-278.

Umbach, Frank (1998b). "Aufruestung in Ostasien. Sicherheitspolitik im Zeitalter der Globalisierung." In: *Internationale Politik*, No. 5: 31-36.

Umbach, Frank (1998c). "Financial Crisis Slows But Fails to Halt East Asian Arms Race - Part I." In: *Jane´s Intelligence Review (JIR)*, August: 23-27.

Umbach, Frank (1998d). "Financial Crisis Slows But Fails to Halt East Asian Arms Race - Part II." In: *Jane´s Intelligence Review (JIR)*, September: 34-37.

Umbach, Frank (1998e). "Strategic Changes in Asia-Pacific - The Dimension of Military Diffusion and Proliferation of Advanced Conventional Weaponry." In: Joachim Krause/Frank Umbach, eds. *Perspectives of Regional Security Challenges and Cooperation in Asia-Pacific: Learning from Europe or Developing Indigenous Models?* Arbeitspapiere zur Internationalen Politik, No. 100, Bonn: 43-69.

Umbach, Frank (1998f). *The Military Balance in the Taiwan Strait and Its Implications for Regional Security*. Paper presented at the conference "The Development of Contemporary Taiwan and Its Implications for Cross-Strait Relations, the Asia-Pacific Region and Europe." INPR, December 16-17, Taipei.

Umbach, Frank (1999a). "Proliferation Challenges in the Asia-Pacific Region and the Implications for the U.S.-Japanese Security Alliance." In: Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA), ed. *Security of Asia-Pacific. Mid-Term Report*. March, Tokyo: 92-107.

Umbach, Frank (1999b). "World Gets Wise to P'yongyang's Nuclear Blackmail – Part One." In: *Jane's Intelligence Review (JIR)*, September: 33-36.

Umbach, Frank (1999c). "World Gets Wise to P'yongyang's Nuclear Blackmail – Part Two." In: *Jane's Intelligence Review* (JIR), October: 35-39.

Umbach, Frank (1999d). "Massenvernichtungswaffen in Asien. Ist die Politik der Nichtverbreitung gescheitert?" In: *Internationale Politik*, October: 47-52.

Umbach, Frank (2000a). "Nuclear Proliferation Challenges in East Asia and Prospects for Co-operation - A View from Europe." In: Kurt W. Radtke/Raymond Feddema, eds. *Comprehensive Security in Asia. Views from Asia and the West on a Changing Security Environment.* Leiden/Boston-Köln: 66-133.

Umbach, Frank (2000b). "ASEAN and Major Powers: Japan and China – A Changing Balance of Power?" In: Dosch, Jörn/Mols, Manfred, eds. *International Relations in the Asia-Pacific. New Patterns of Power, Interest and Cooperation*. Hamburg/Münster/London.

Wachman, Alan M. (1998). "Words Matter." In: *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 16 July: 55.

Wagner, Martin (1999). "Amerikanische Asien-Pazifik-Politik aus der Sicht des Pentagons." In: *Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift (ÖMZ)*, No. 3, May/June: 269-280.

Walt, Steven M. (1987). *The Origins of Alliances.* Ithaca/London.

Walt, Steven M. (1989). "Alliances in Theory and Practice: What Lies Ahead?" In: *Journal of International Affairs*, No. 1: 1-17.

Wang, Jianwei/Wu, Xinbo (1998). *Against Us or With Us? The Chinese Perspective of America's Alliances with Japan and Korea*. Asia/Pacific Research Center, Institute for International Studies, Stanford University.
Wendt, Alexander Wendt (1995). "Constructing International Politics." In: *International Security* No. 1: 71-81.
Woolley, Peter J./Woolley, Mark S. (1996). "Japan's Sea Lane Defense Re-visited." In: *Strategic Review*, Fall: 49-58.
Yamaguchi, Noboru (1997). "Why the U.S. Marines Should Remain in Okinawa: A Military Perspective." In: Ralph A. Cossa, ed. *Restructuring the U.S.-Japan Alliance. Toward a More Equal Alliance.* The CSIS Press, Washington: 98-110.
Yunling, Zhang (1997). "Changing Sino-US-Japanese Relations." In: *The Pacific Review*, No. 4: 451-465.